

THE
PANOPLIST,
AND
MISSIONARY MAGAZINE UNITED.

No. 3.

AUGUST, 1811.

VOL. IV.

BIOGRAPHY.

LIFE AND REMAINS OF HENRY KIRKE WHITE.

The following article is taken from the *Eclectic Review*, for March, 1807, vol. iv, p. 193. While the reader is astonished at the splendid talents and attainments of this extraordinary youth, he will, if pious, rejoice that such peculiar endowments, were sanctified by religion.

ED. PAN.

Not long ago we were called upon, in the course of our duty, to examine the *Memoirs* of an unfortunate son of the Muses,* who in infancy excited the admiration of the public by the prematurity of his powers, but abandoning himself to indolence and sensuality, outlived, ere his youth was gone by, the liberality of his numerous patrons, and the kindness of his few friends (one only excepted, who has dishonored his memory by becoming his biographer) and perished miserably, at the age of twenty-seven years;—affording in his life, and by his death, a melancholy proof, that as the body is debilitated, diseased, and destroyed, so is genius degraded, emasculated, and extinguished, by habits of vice; and that sin is not less the enemy of those noble endowments that command “the praise of men,” than of the lowly-minded graces that ensure “the praise

of God.” It will now be our pleasing yet mournful employment, to review the *Life and Remains* of a more amiable youth, of genius more than equal, but of fortune far less extravagantly exalted and cast down; who, in the course of twenty-one years, the span of his brief but illustrious career, by indefatigable perseverance in study, unquenchable ardor of genius, sincere and progressive piety, distinguished himself as a scholar, a poet, and a Christian. In almost every point, except talents, Henry Kirke White, and Thomas Dermody were the antipodes of each other. Few, perhaps, of the relics of either will continue to astonish and delight the public, beyond the present generation; but the stories of both will most probably be held in everlasting remembrance, the one as a cheering example, the other as a terrible warning to youthful poets, when struggling with poverty, or assailed by temptation.

* See *Ecl. Rev.* Sept. 1806, *Life of Thomas Dermody*, Vol. II, p. 701.
VOL. IV. *New Series.*

The contents of these volumes are so very miscellaneous, that our remarks upon them must be rather desultory. We shall follow the arrangement of matter as we find it, beginning with the "Account of the Life" of this lamented youth, by Mr. Southey, who has done honor both to himself and to his friend, by the candor and kindness which he has displayed in the functions of his biographer and editor. We shall offer a sketch of the Life, including some passages from Mr. Southey's narrative, as examples of his manner.

Henry Kirke White was born at Nottingham, on the 21st of March, 1785. His father, still living, is a butcher. His mother, during the latter years of her son's life, kept a respectable boarding-school for young ladies. Henry was taught to read by a Mrs. Grassington, one of those notable matrons, by whom children, in the country, are generally instructed in the mysteries of A, B, C. In one of his earliest poems, intitled "*Childhood*," he pleasantly describes his progress in learning under this ancient Sybil, who foresaw and foretold his future glories. It would be difficult to ascertain at how early a period the human mind may receive those effectual influences, that decide and develop its character, and determine one man a poet, another a painter, and a third a politician; or, in a word, that make every man *the man that he shall be* through life. Biography and History are, in general, equally deficient of accurate information concerning the infancy of individuals and of nations, though the annals of that age in each, consisting of

minute and apparently worthless circumstances, form perhaps the most interesting portion of the history of the human mind;—since trivial circumstances, at that time, are of greater and more abiding influence, than mightier and more imposing events at a later period of their existence. Romulus was the founder not only of the city, but of the empire of Rome; not only the leader of a band of Brigands, but the father of the Conquerors of the world. He stamped the image of his soul upon all succeeding generations. The fratricide of Remus, and the rape of the Sabine women, were the first scenes of that tragedy of violence, which *continued* to be acted throughout the earth during more than ten centuries.—Had Remus, in their quarrel, slain Romulus, it is probable, according to human calculation, that Rome would never have risen in distinction above the neighboring cities, and the Cæsars might have been shepherds on the plains of Campania. But the spirit of Romulus breathed through all his posterity, and never quitted the capitol, till the seat of empire was translated from Rome to Constantinople. As the future destinies of nations are influenced by the genius and actions of their founders, so are the talents and tempers of individuals determined, in a great measure, by the character of their relatives and associates, the lessons which they are taught, the amusements to which they are led, and in literature, above all, by the books which accident may cast in their way, but to which they attach themselves with spontaneous and almost in-

instinctive devotion. Nothing is trifling or insignificant in childhood, where every thing tends to form the future bias of an immortal mind, and every event that awakens a new emotion, is the certain forerunner of everlasting consequences. Such is the circumstance of Henry being accustomed, *before he was six years old*, to hear a certain damsel sing the affecting ballad of "The Babes in the Wood," and others, alluded to in the following lines of the poem above mentioned, written when he was not much more than twice that age.

"Many's the time I've scamper'd
down the glade,
"To ask the promis'd ditty from the
maid,
"Which well she loved, as well she
knew to sing,
"While we around her form'd a little
ring;
"She told of innocence foredoom'd to
bleed,
"Of wicked guardians, bent on bloody
deed,
"Of little children murder'd as they
slept;
"While at each pause we wrung our
hands and wept.
* * * * *
"Beloved moment! then 'twas first I
caught
"The first foundation of romantic
thought;
* * * * *
"Then first that poesy charm'd mine
infant ear:
"I hied me to the thick o'erarching
shade," &c. &c.

The heart of any child would be touched by such ditties; but the future poet alone would retire into solitude, to meditate upon them.

From Mr. Southey's account we learn, that about the age of seven, Henry was not only a Scholar, but a Schoolmaster; for

"he used to creep unperceived into the kitchen, to teach the servant to read and write."— This girl appears to have been chief in his confidence; for to her alone he imparted "the tale of a Swiss emigrant," which was probably his first performance, being ashamed to show it to his mother. At this time he was a great reader. "I could fancy," says his eldest sister, "that I see him in his little chair, with a large book upon his knee, and my mother calling, 'Henry, my love, come to dinner;' which was repeated so often without being regarded, that she was obliged to change the tone of her voice before she could rouse him." What books he read we are not informed; but from some lines in the poem of "*Childhood*," we find that he was acquainted, at an early age, with Spenser and Milton. Describing his evening walks with a school-companion, (for, from his sixth to his twelfth year, he attended the academy of a clergyman at Nottingham) he says,

'To gaze upon the clouds, whose col-
or'd pride
Was scatter'd thinly o'er the welkin
wide,
And tinged with such variety of shade,
To the charm'd soul sublimest tho'ts
conveyed.
In these what forms romantic did we
trace,
While fancy led us o'er the realms of
space;
*Now we espied the thunderer in his car,
Leading the embattled seraphim to
war;*
Then stately towers descried, sub-
limely high,
In Gothic grandeur frowning on the
sky;
Or saw, wide stretching o'er the
azure height,
A ridge of glaciers in mural white,
Hugely terrific.' Vol. I, p. 292.

Any eye might form towers and glaciers in the romantic clouds of evening; but the imagination of a poet alone, fired with the *first* perusal of Milton, could discern in them the battle-array of the seraphim, and the war in heaven. At this academy, nevertheless, it seems that he passed for a blockhead, among blockheads, who naturally enough concluded that he could not learn *because* they could not teach. He revenged himself in secret, by writing lampoons on them. Here, however, he remained six years; and mortifying indeed it must have been to the pride of genius, already quick and kindling within him, that "one whole day in the week, and his leisure hours on the others, were employed in carrying the butcher's basket, his father being determined to bring him up to his own trade." Henry was afterwards removed to another school in Nottingham, the master of which, being as wise as the old woman who taught him his letters, discovered his hidden talents, and communicated the joyful tidings to his affectionate mother, whom the false report of his former master had rendered very unhappy.

About this time he wrote the earliest of his published poems, "*On being confined to School on a pleasant Spring Morning*," which not only displays considerable talent, but proves that even then he was well practised in the art of rhyming.

It was now resolved to bring him up to the hosiery business; and, at the age of fourteen, he was placed in a stocking-loom, with the view of afterwards obtaining a situation in a warehouse.

Here he was so miserably out of his element, that after twelve months of continual repining on his part, and remonstrance on that of his family, he was removed to an employment more suited to his aspiring mind. He was established in the office of Messrs. Coldham and Enfield, town-clerks of Nottingham.—Here, in addition to the exhausting labors and studies of the law, he employed his leisure hours in acquiring a knowledge of the Greek, Latin, French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese languages; in each of which he made considerable progress. Chemistry, astronomy, and electricity, were also numbered among his morning, noon, evening, and midnight amusements. If time be computed by its occupation he made a minute of every moment of his leisure, and every day added sensibly to his stock of knowledge. He was passionately fond of music, but had the prudence to refrain from dallying with that Syren art, which steals away the soul from more exalted employments. He had also a turn for mechanics; and most of the furniture of his little study was the workmanship of his own hands. His most delightful relaxation was the exercise of his powers of composition, both in prose and verse.—His first essays in the former obtained for him several prizes, given by the proprietors of a Magazine, called "*The Monthly Preceptor*;" and his first flights in the latter soon gave him a distinguished rank among the periodical poets of the time in the "*Monthly Mirror*." He likewise became a member of a literary society at Nottingham, and

one evening astonished his brethren with a lecture on Genius, of two hours length, delivered *extempore* with great fervor and volubility. At that time he aspired to the bar, and thought it necessary to practise himself in public speaking.

In the year 1803, he was emboldened by the success of his fugitive pieces, to publish "*Cliston Grove, and other Poems.*" His anxieties and disappointments in pursuit of a patron, to give his work (what no work of genius ever wanted) the sanction of a splendid name, were at length rewarded with permission to dedicate it to the late Duchess of Devonshire; but permission was all that he ever obtained; and it was too dearly purchased by a copy of the poems in their "due morocco livery," which was sent to her Grace, but probably never reached her hands.

A frigid and superficial critique on these Poems, in one of the Reviews, almost broke the hopes and the heart of the author; but the friendship of Mr. Southey, which he acquired by this very circumstance, was an ample compensation for the anguish that he felt on this occasion. The following little piece will enable our readers to guess, whether the volume that contained it deserved harsh reprobation.

'TO THE HERB ROSEMARY.*

"Sweet scented flower! who art
wont to bloom
On January's front severe:
And o'er the wintry desert drear
To waft thy waste perfume!

* *The Rosemary buds in January—It is the flower commonly put in the coffins of the dead.*

Come thou shalt form my nosegay
now,
And I will bind thee round my brow,
And as I twine the mournful
wreath,
I'll weave a melancholy song,
And sweet the strain shall be, and
long,
The melody of death.

Come, funeral flow'r! who lov'st to
dwell
With the pale corse in lonely tomb,
And throw across the desert gloom
A sweet decaying smell,
Come press my lips, and lie with me
Beneath the lowly Alder tree,
And we will sleep a pleasant sleep,
And not a care shall dare intrude
To break the marble solitude,
So peaceful and so deep.

And hark! the wind-god as he flies,
Moans hollow in the forest-trees,
And sailing on the gusty breeze
Mysterious music dies.
Sweet flower, that requiem wild is
mine,
It warns me to the lonely shrine,
The cold turf altar of the dead;
My grave shall be in yon lone spot,
Where as I lie, by all forgot,
A dying fragrance thou wilt o'er my
ashes shed." Vol. I, p. 19.

There is a tenderness of thought and expression in the last stanza, which, at this time, when the prophecy has been fulfilled, must touch the most insensible heart. It is remarkable that in many of poor Henry's pieces, written at different ages, there are strong and melancholy forebodings of an early death.

It was the author's fondest hope by this publication to attract friends, by whose assistance he might be enabled to quit the law (the study of which had become wearisome, since it was no longer likely to be profitable to him as a Barrister, on account of a deafness that was growing upon him,) and to pursue his stu-

dies at one of the Universities, to qualify himself for the Ministry, to which his mind was now most ardently directed by an extraordinary spiritual change which took place in him about this period. Mr. Southey says,

'I have stated that his opinions were, at one time, inclining towards Deism; it needs not be said on what slight grounds the opinions of a youth must needs be founded: while they are confined to matters of speculation, they indicate, whatever their eccentricities, only an active mind; and it is only when a propensity is manifested to such principles as give a sanction to immorality, that they show something wrong at heart.'—Vol. I, p. 27.

We quote this passage to protest against the plausible and insidious error at the end of it. *Such opinions always indicate "something wrong at heart:"* they shew its natural deformity, and determined enmity against God. Genius, if not the child, is the nurseling of Pride: the youth, deeply conscious of possessing it, cherishes the "sacred and solitary feeling" with a jealousy that tolerates no rivalry; it is "the Divinity that stirs within him," and he worships it with a constancy and ardor of devotion that shame the lukewarmness and formality with which others serve the true God. Perhaps no youth, thus eminently gifted, ever passed the age of eighteen in a Christian country, who did not, at that sanguine period when man is most confident in his strength, because most ignorant of his weakness, resist and reject the evidences of the glorious Gospel of Christ, and exult in having discovered the *truths of Infidelity* in the

darkness of the light of Nature. To such an one, the doctrine of the cross is not only "foolishness," as it is to the Greek, but "a stumbling block" also, as it is "to the Jew." It requires the sacrifice of all that is most dear to untegenerated man, and enjoins a humility of spirit, and a brokenness of heart, which is death to that mode of ambition that exists in the carnal mind. We do not say that this elevated feeling must be extinguished by the grace of God, any more than the other passions of our nature, which sin has corrupted; but, like them, it must be renewed in the converted sinner, and, from being an insatiable appetite for self-exaltation, it must become a fervent, unquenchable zeal for the glory of God.

Henry was in this perilous state, when the Rev. Mr. Pigott, a clergyman of Nottingham, with an amiable concern for his everlasting welfare, sent him "*Scott's Force of Truth*," which he received with supercilious indifference, telling the person who brought it, that he could soon write an answer to it; but when that person called upon him about a fortnight afterwards, his answer was of a very different tone and temper.

'He said, that to answer that book was out of his power, and out of any man's, for it was founded upon eternal truth; that it had convinced him of his error; and that so thoroughly was he impressed with a sense of the importance of his Maker's favor, that he would willingly give up all acquisitions of knowledge, and all hopes of fame, and live in a wilderness, unknown, till death, so he could insure an inheritance in heaven.' Vol. I, p. 29.

On this subject, the above-named Clergyman, as quoted by Mr. Southey, adds,

‘What he said to me when we became intimate, is worthy of observation: that, he said, which first made him dissatisfied with the creed he had adopted and the standard of practice which he had set up for himself, was the *purity of mind* which he perceived was every where inculcated in the Holy Scriptures, and required of every one who would become a successful candidate for future blessedness. He had supposed that morality of conduct was all the purity required; but when he observed that purity of the very *thoughts and intentions* of the soul also, was requisite, he was convinced of his deficiencies, and could find no comfort to his penitence, but in the atonement made for human frailty by the Redeemer of mankind, and no strength adequate to his weakness, and sufficient for resisting evil, but the aids of God’s spirit, promised to those who seek them from above in the sincerity of earnest prayer.’ Vol. I, p. 31.

From the moment that he was led by the Spirit of God into “the narrow way” of life, he determined to devote himself to the duty of warning others from “the broad road” to destruction. It was with this view that he wished for a place in one of the universities, to qualify himself for taking orders in the Church, resolving, if that could not be obtained, to join the Calvinistic Dissenters, or even to go to the East-Indies, there to offer himself as a Student, at Fort-William, in Bengal, and afterwards to become a Missionary among the Gentoos. Many delays, discouragements, and difficulties, which we have not room to recapitulate, intervened before he could obtain the first object of his desires, though Messrs. Coldham and Enfield liberally gave him up

his articles of Clerkship; but at length, with a very slender provision, namely, 30*l.* per annum, paid to him by Mr. Simeon, of Cambridge, (of which it afterwards appeared that 20*l.* were from Mr. Wilberforce, and 10*l.* from himself) 20*l.* more from his brother Neville, who was settled in London, and 15 or 20*l.* more from his mother; he became a Sizar of St. John’s College, Cambridge.

Mr. Simeon having advised him to *degrade* for a year, he placed himself under the Rev. Mr. Granger, of Wintringham, in Lincolnshire, where he studied with such intense application, that his health was dangerously impaired, and he was compelled to relax a little. The following passage from Mr. Southey’s narrative, will shew how severely he afterwards exercised himself at College.

‘During his first term, one of the University Scholarships became vacant, and Henry, young as he was in College, and almost self-taught, was advised, by those who were best able to estimate his chance of success to offer himself as a competitor for it. He past the whole term in preparing himself for this, reading for College subjects in bed, in his walks, or, as he says, where, when, and how he could, never having a moment to spare, and often going to his tutor without having read at all. His strength sunk under this, and though he had declared himself a candidate, he was compelled to decline; but this was not the only misfortune. The general College examination came on; he was utterly unprepared to meet it, and believed that a failure here would have ruined his prospects for ever. He had only about a fortnight to read what other men had been the whole term reading. Once more he exerted himself beyond what his shattered health could bear; the disorder returned, and he went to his tutor, Mr.

Catton, with tears in his eyes, and told him that he could not go into the Hall to be examined. *Mr. Catton*, however, thought his success here of so much importance, that he exhorted him, with all possible earnestness, to hold out the six days of the examination. Strong medicines were given him, to enable him to support it, and he was pronounced the first man of his year. But life was the price which he was to pay for such honors as this, and Henry is not the first young man to whom such honors have proved fatal. He said to his most intimate friend, almost the last time he saw him, that were he to paint a picture of Fame crowning a distinguished under-graduate, after the Senate house examination, he would represent her as concealing a Death's-head under a mask of beauty.' Vol. I, pp. 44, 45.

'The exercise which Henry took was no relaxation; he still continued the habit of studying while he walked; and in this manner, while he was at Cambridge, committed to memory a whole tragedy of Euripides. Twice he distinguished himself in the following year, being again pronounced first at the great College examination, and also one of the three best theme writers, between whom the examiners could not decide. The College offered him, at their expense, a private tutor in mathematics during the long vacation; and *Mr. Catton*, by procuring for him exhibitions to the amount of 66*l.* per annum, enabled him to give up the pecuniary assistance which he had received from *Mr. Wilberforce* and *Mr. Simeon*. Never, perhaps, had any young man, in so short a time, excited such expectations; every University honor was thought to be within his reach; he was set down as a medallist, and expected to take a senior wrangler's degree: but these expectations were poison to him; they goaded him to fresh exertions when his strength was spent. His situation became truly miserable; to his brother, and to his mother, he wrote always that he had relaxed in his studies, and that he was better; always holding out to them his hopes and his good fortune; but to the most intimate of

his friends, (*Mr. Maddock*,) his letters told a different tale: to him he complained of dreadful palpitations—of nights of sleeplessness and horror, and of spirits depressed to the very depth of wretchedness, so that he went from one acquaintance to another imploring society, even as a starving beggar entreats for food.' Vol. I, pp. 48, 49.

Such exertions and triumphs soon brought him to the grave. His mind was worn out; and it was the opinion of his medical attendants, that if his life had been protracted, his intellect would have been impaired. On the 19th of October, 1806, it pleased God to remove him to a better world, in the 22nd year of his age.

"His moral qualities, his good sense, and his whole feelings, were as admirable as his industry and genius."—"It is not possible to conceive a human being more amiable in all the relations of life."—"Of his fervent piety, his letters, his prayers, and his hymns, will afford ample and interesting proofs."—"It (his piety) was in him a living and quickening principle of goodness, which sanctified all his hopes and all his affections, which made him keep watch over his own heart, and enabled him to correct the few symptoms, which it ever displayed, of human imperfection." So says *Mr. Southey*; but we must add, from a conviction of its truth, that few as were the symptoms of human imperfection which his heart ever displayed, his conversion (which we believe to have been real) was one of those signal miracles of Divine Mercy, by which the Redeemer manifests his willingness and his ability to save to the uttermost all that come to God by

him. It was almighty grace alone that brought down the towering pride of Henry, and bound his immeasurable ambition to the foot of the cross.

His manuscripts, exclusive of his correspondence, which after his decease were delivered to Mr. Southey, filled a large box. They consisted of papers on law, electricity, chemistry, the Latin and Greek languages, criticism, history, chronology, divinity, the fathers, &c. His poems were very numerous. Mr. Southey adds, "I have examined all the existing manuscripts of Chatterton, and they excited less wonder than these."

We have been led into such unexpected, yet unavoidable length, in this memoir of Henry Kirke White, that we must be much more brief than we intended in reviewing his "Remains." But having already made our readers tolerably intimate with the character of this extraordinary youth, it will be sufficient to offer a few extracts from his various works, leaving them to estimate his genius and his worth.

In his "Letters," having been previously acquainted with his poetry, we were rather disappointed. There is little in them of fine fancy, romantic feeling, or impassioned eloquence. Their distinguishing features are good sense, and pious sentiment, strongly enforced, and sometimes admirably expressed. The following extract from a letter dated "Wintringham, April, 1805," (while he resided with the Rev. Mr. Granger) contains an amusing and truly characteristic anecdote of the writer, who certainly was as little of a being

of this world as one born and bred in it well could be.

'Almond and I took a small boat on Monday, and set out for Hull, a distance of thirteen miles, as some compute it, though others make it less. We went very merrily with a good pair of oars, until we came within four miles of Hull, when owing to some hard working, we were quite exhausted; but as the tide was nearly down, and the shore soft, we could not get to any villages on the banks. At length we made Hull, and just arrived in time to be grounded in the middle of the harbor, without any possible means of getting ashore till the flux or flood. As we were half famished, I determined to wade ashore for provisions, and had the satisfaction of getting above the knees in mud almost every step I made. When I got ashore, I recollected I had given Almond all my cash. This was a terrible dilemma—to return back was too laborious, and I expected the tide flowing every minute. At last I determined to go to the inn where we usually dine when we go to Hull, and try how much credit I possessed there, and I happily found no difficulty in procuring refreshments, which I carried off in triumph to the boat. Here new difficulties occurred; for the tide had flowed in considerably during my absence, although not sufficiently to move the boat, so that my wade was much worse back than it had been before. On our return, a most placid and calm day was converted into a cloudy one, and we had a brisk gale in our teeth. Knowing we were quite safe, we struck across from Hull to Barton, and when we were off Hazel Whelps, a place which is always rough, we had some tremendous swells, which we weathered admirably, and (bating our getting on the wrong side of a bank, owing to the deceitful appearance of the coast) we had a prosperous voyage home, having rowed twenty-six miles in less than five hours.' Vol. I, pp. 154—155.

(*To be concluded in our next.*)

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

LECTURES ON THE EVIDENCES OF DIVINE REVELATION.

No. X.

THE ejection of Adam and Eve from Paradise, and the institution of Sacrifices. Gen. iii, 20,—24, and iv, 1—4.

The subjects of consideration, contained in these passages of Scripture, I shall mention in the order observed by *Moses*.

1. Immediately after the Sentence, *Adam*, we are informed, called his wife's name *Eve*; *Chavah*, Life or Living. This name, given to her instead of her former name, Woman, given too by the person, who gave the former name, and especially given on such an occasion, is certainly very remarkable. The Sentence declared, that both *Adam*, and *Eve*, should terminate a life of sorrow with death. In consequence of this sentence, *Adam* changed her former name Woman, for *Eve*, Life; and, as *Moses* informs us, for this reason: That she, though under the sentence of death, was the mother of all living. I am ready to believe, that God endowed *Adam* with common sense; and am, therefore, induced to look for something in the Sentence, which will reconcile with common sense his conduct, in giving his wife this appellation. The Sentence contains but one thing of this nature. It is this: God promised in the Sentence, that *the Seed of the woman should bruise the head of the Serpent*. This declaration, understood as Christians understand it, teaches us, and taught *Adam*, that some, at least, of his

posterity, were to live in such a sense, as he was to have lived, if he had continued to be obedient; viz. with immortal life; and that all these should live by means of the Seed of the woman. In this view, she became the mother of all the living. Hence, with the strictest propriety, she was named *Eve*, or *Chavah*; or, as the Septuagint, Ζωη.

2. At this time, also, God was pleased to clothe our first parents with the skins of beasts. These I consider as the skins of victims slain for sacrifice; and shall endeavor to shew, that sacrifices were now instituted.

3. To prevent our first parents from eating of the tree of life, and to teach them their alienation from himself, God sent them forth from Paradise, and commanded them to till the ground, whence they were taken.

The Tree of Life may, on the principles of the soundest philosophy, have been, and not improbably was, designed to be the means of rendering man immortal. At the same time, it is unnecessary, that we should consider it as any other, than a sacramental pledge of immortality. For every purpose of these Lectures, indeed, it is sufficient, if it be regarded as a mere Symbol of immortality; and this mode of considering it, will probably be admitted even by Infidels.

4. We are told, that after *Adam* and *Eve* were banished from Para-

dise; God placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the Tree of Life.

This part of the Mosaic history has been the ground of many objections; and must be acknowledged to contain some difficulties. They do not arise from what is said, but from what is not said. There is nothing said, which even those, who seek occasion, can reasonably object to; nothing, which impeaches, or in any degree lessens, the credibility of the history. As the whole account, however, is comprised in a single short sentence, its conciseness renders it difficult to be understood; and leaves the mind to wish, that additions, and explanations, had been furnished to render it capable of being more satisfactorily comprehended.

The interpretation of this passage, which has been most current among divines, is the obvious one: That the Cherubims and flaming sword were placed in the east of Eden, to prevent the access of man to the Tree of Life. This, however, is not the oldest, nor probably the original interpretation. The two oldest comments in the world are the two Jewish Targums; and these paraphrase the verse in this manner: "And he thrust out the man, and caused the glory of his presence to dwell of old at the east of the garden of Eden, above the two Cherubims:" i. e. After God had removed *Adam* out of Paradise, he caused the *Shechinah*, or glory of God, with the Cherubims, its attendants, to dwell in the east of Eden, to keep, or preserve, the way of the Tree of Life, not from the ac-

cess, but for the attainment, of man. In support of this explanation, beside the authority of the Paraphrasts, which is confessedly great, and to be considered as supported by the sense of the Jewish Church; it is acknowledged, that the words, translated *flaming sword*, are literally rendered *fiery division*, i. e. a dividing, or, as it is afterwards called by *Ezekiel*, an *infolding*, fire. If this interpretation be admitted; the passage declares, that after the fall God was pleased to dwell by his oracular presence in the east of *Eden*; as, during the ages of the Jewish Church, he dwelt in the tabernacle, and in the temple. Here he gave oracles to the antediluvian Church, and received their worship. Here he taught them the way to immortal life; and preserved it from being utterly lost by the degeneracy of man.* It has been supposed by those, who have adopted the common interpretation, that the access of man to the Tree of Life was forbidden, to prevent him from looking for life to this original pledge of it, and to turn his future thoughts to Christ, its antitype, as the source of this great blessing. This is supposed to have been necessary, because of the almost necessary tendency of human nature, circumstanced as it then was, to seek for life, where alone it could have been originally obtained. The reality of this tendency, and the importance of checking it, I readily acknowledge; yet it may be difficult to prove, that the check, here supposed, was necessary; or that the end would be more effectually

* See *Bishop Horne's Letters*

answered by it, than by a series of oracular directions, given from the Shechinah by God himself. It will also be difficult to prove, that any thing could be more necessary, or useful, to man, than the presence and direction of God, to guide and influence him to repentance, reformation, and worship; and to encourage him to attempt, and pursue, the great business of reconciliation with his Maker. If we consider the height of enjoyment, and of privileges, from which man had just fallen, and the gloomy depression, into which he had sunk, the entire knowledge of his present situation, and the necessary ignorance of the means of his recovery; if we call to mind his inability, from the comparison of moral subjects, to form any but uncertain and distressing conclusions, and his natural, and almost unavoidable, tendency towards despair; if we recollect, that God thought it necessary to communicate to him, in the Sentence itself, the grounds of hope and recovery, and to interfere even in the inferior concern of clothing his body; we shall not, I believe, hesitate to acknowledge the interpretation of the Jewish Paraphrasts, as at least natural, rational, and probable. According to this interpretation, God, is exhibited as completing his merciful designs to our first parents, and their posterity, by appearing to them as a reconcilable God and teaching them, in a direct, indubitable manner, the several things, which were now become essential parts of their duty.

After the removal of man from Paradise, two sons are declared

to have been born to him, named *Cain* and *Abel*.

When these children were grown up, *Cain*, being a tiller of the ground, brought unto God an offering of the fruit of the ground. *Abel*, being a keeper of sheep, presented, at the same time, an offering of the firstlings of his flock. These were the first formal oblations, mentioned in the history of mankind. On the interesting subject of sacrifices, I make the following remarks.

First: Sacrifices have been common to all nations of antiquity, of whose religious history we have any account; and of most nations, comparatively moral. They were used in *Japan*, and in *Mexico*; in *Lapland*, and in the country of the *Hottentots*.

Secondly: They were always, without an exception, a religious service.

Thirdly: They were intended to be expressions of gratitude, symbols of supplication, and especially means of expiation, in every people, by whom they were used.

Fourthly: Almost all nations appear to have sacrificed the same things, so far as they were in their possession; particularly oil, wine, water, cakes, meal, fruits, aromatics, and those, which, in the Scriptures, are styled clean beasts, and birds. Very few offered beasts of prey, or wild beasts of any kind; birds of prey, fishes, or reptiles.

Fifthly: Human sacrifices have been customarily offered throughout the world.

In Asia they were offered by the following nations: the Hindoos, Persians, Massagetæ, Scythians, Arabians, Ionians, people of Tenedos, Rhodians, Syrians,

Chaldeans, Babylonians, Albanians, Sarmatians, nations of Canaan, Jews, in the latter times of their nation, people of Dumah, or Idumea, Phœnicians, Laodiceans, Blemyans, Taurians, and Neurians; In Europe by the ancient states of Greece; particularly Messene, the Pelasgi, the people of Lacedæmon, Attica, Phœcea, Chios, Lesbos, Salamis, Crete, Cyprus; the Celtæ, who inhabited Britain, Gaul, Switzerland, the north of Italy, Spain, and the northern parts of Thrace; the Thracians, Tauric Chersonesians, Massilians, Germans, Romans, Norwegians, Swedes, Danes, the Getæ, Scottish Islanders, Icelanders: In Africa, by the Egyptians, Carthaginians, inhabitants of the Canary Isles, nations of Guinea; and in America, by the Mexicans, and Peruvians.

To these may be added, in several instances, the Islanders, discovered by Capt. Cooke.

To this account I shall subjoin a few remarks.

The writers, testifying to the fact of human sacrifices, are *Cicero, Ennius, Livy, Pliny, Tacitus, Seneca, Lucan, Silius Italicus, Cæsar, Porphyry, Sanchoniathon, Manetho*, the author of the *Ayecn Akberry*, &c. &c.

Pliny observes, that the people of *Marseilles*, when a distinct state, coincided in offering human sacrifices with the whole world, although unknown to them, and differing from them in other respects.

Sanchoniathon declares, that from the earliest times princes and magistrates offered human victims; particularly their own dearest children.

This custom is directly recognized in the question of *Balak*,

king of *Moab*, to *Balaam*, recorded by the prophet *Micah*: *Shall I give my first born for my transgression; the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?*

The general testimony of *Hindoo, Persian, Roman, and Greek* writers, on this subject, declares, that sacrifices were chiefly expiatory.

The *Scandinavians* held, that it was essential to their prosperity to offer human sacrifices; and believed human victims to be more auspicious than any other; particularly victims of the blood royal.

Many nations selected their victims: as, the *Egyptians, Phœnicians, Romans, Scandinavians, Albanians, Britons, Carthaginians*, &c.

The *Albanians* chose the best men of their nation; and the *Egyptians* the handsomest.

The *Romans* sacrificed, annually, a male and female *Gaul*, and a male and female *Greek*.

The *Tauric Chersonesians* sacrificed to *Diana* every stranger, whom chance threw on their coast.

The *Lacedæmonians* whipped their boys to death to *Diana Orthia*.

Aristomenes, the *Messenian*, sacrificed 300 *Lacedæmonians* at once to *Jupiter*.

The *Carthaginians* offered up in a single sacrifice 300 young noblemen.

The *Peruvians* offered the same number in their yearly sacrifice.

The *Mexicans* annually sacrificed 20,000.

The *Hindoos*, and *Egyptians*, had large and expensive cavern temples consecrated to this dreadful service.

The people of various parts of *Guinea* still offer human victims; as do also the *Hindoos* and several other nations.

The origin of sacrifices has been ascribed to the *Phœnicians*. As this opinion is loose and unsupported, it needs no consideration; but there are four others, which deserve some remarks.

1. That of *Porphyry*; who attributes their origin to the *Egyptians*; and says, that they consisted, at first, of the first fruits of their grounds; which they burned upon an altar of turf to their gods. In the most ancient sacrifices he says there were neither living creatures, nor myrrh, nor frankincense, nor any thing expensive or magnificent: but afterwards they began to burn perfumes; and at length, changing their diet from roots and herbs to living animals, they changed their sacrifices.

On this opinion, it is sufficient to observe, that it cannot be true; because the *Persians*, *Hindoos*, and *Chinese*, sacrificed, long before they had any correspondence with the *Egyptians*; and therefore they and the *Egyptians* certainly derived the practice from a common source: a source, that cannot have been nearer than *Noah*.

Noah also sacrificed animals, long before the *Egyptians* sacrificed fruits; as did, also, the *Hindoos* and *Chinese*.

2. Dr. *Warburton* supposes, that they were offered merely as a language of Symbols; because in the beginning human language was not furnished with words, proper to express gratitude, supplication, and penitence.

On this supposition I observe,

First: Man was never unpossessed of a language, which would properly express every emotion, capable of being symbolically expressed by sacrifices.

Dr. *Warburton* would undoubtedly admit arguments, adduced from the Scriptures. But in the Scriptures we are decisively informed, that *Adam* was endowed with language by his Maker; and, plainly, with religious language. *Abel* and *Cain*, educated in his family knew the same language. They therefore needed no symbols, much less these very artificial ones, to express their emotions.

Secondly: It cannot be admitted, that *Adam* worshipped God in any manner, which was not instituted by God himself. God punished *Nadab* and *Abihu* for worshipping him in a manner, not instituted by him. After their death He declared it, as his own pleasure, that he would be worshipped in his own institutions only. It was, therefore, his pleasure in the days of *Adam*. That God was pleased with sacrifices is evident from the story of *Abel's* acceptance, as well as the story of *Noah* and of *Abraham*.

Thirdly: It is incredible, that God should copy into his own institutions inventions of men. Yet God instituted sacrifices for the Jews in a very solemn and extensive manner.

3. Infidels have supposed, that sacrifices began among all nations, when they were in a state of ignorance and barbarity; or when they were mere savages.

Sacrifices, they suppose these people thought, would appease the anger of their deities, and conciliate their favor. As the victims were their own most

valuable property, their deities, it is alleged, would be believed by them to prize the victims in much the same manner, as they were prized by themselves.

On this opinion I observe,

First; It is not pretended, that such a practice could have sprung from the principles alleged, among any people except the merest and most ignorant savages.

Secondly: It is scarcely credible, that the most discerning men even among such savages, and such usually directed their religion, could believe, that their gods were capable of being pleased with such offerings. The heathen gods are, indeed, sometimes represented by heathen writers, as pleased with the smell of the burning victim: but this, it is presumed, is always a figurative representation: The god being intentionally exhibited, as in fact pleased only by the reverence, or obedience, manifested by the suppliant in this religious act.

Thirdly: Such savages can be supposed to have fallen on this as an acceptable service to their gods, only as one, out of many rites, by which they might be pleased. Almost any thing, which was pleasing to men, might be supposed to be no less pleasing to their gods than a sacrifice. A large part of such things may safely be pronounced to promise, in this respect, more to the human mind, than can be pretended of this. By such a mind, inquiring how to please its gods, a sacrifice, if adopted from the principles alleged, cannot be supposed to have been adopted in more instances, than would be the result of proportional chan-

ces. If we consider, that sacrificing promises so little, and costs so much; we shall be convinced, that a proportional chance is all, that can be demanded, or allowed. It is to be remembered, that the mind, in contemplating this subject originally, would regard it with very different views from those, which it would entertain, when the practice had become established.

But sacrificing has prevailed in every nation; i. e. every ancient nation: while several other modes of worship, at least equally natural, and presenting themselves to the mind with as fair a promise of being acceptable services, have been adopted rarely and imperfectly, or not at all.

Fourthly: Sacrificing has existed in various nations, who were never savages. Such were the *Hindoos, Chinese, Persians, Egyptians, &c.* Through these nations, also, the rite came to most others; or through the unknown ancestors of other nations, contemporary with these in their most ancient periods.

Noah sacrificed. *Fohi*, the first king of *China*, also sacrificed. *Menu*, the first real person in the *Hindoo* history, sacrificed.

Sanchoniathon and *Manetho* testify, that sacrificing was of the earliest date among the *Phenicians* and *Egyptians*.

Fifthly: With respect to these nations, also, it is to be observed, that the earliest sacrifices alluded to, were considered not as innovations, but as the result of former customs.

Sixthly: Most of these nations, also, worshipped, at the time specified, the One living and true God; who was never supposed by any person, that wor-

shipped him, to delight in sacrifices in any such sense. Hence,

Seventhly: With respect to these nations, the principles alleged have no application: Of course the supposition falls to the ground.

Eighthly: No heathen nation knew the origin of sacrifices.

The only reason for them, ever given by these nations, was *the custom of their ancestors*. *Plutarch* justly resolves all the authority for the heathen worship into this custom. If the reason, against which I am contending, offers itself to the mind so naturally, as to have become in so many nations the real ground of sacrificing; it is wholly unaccountable, that no heathen writer should have alleged it either as his own reason, or that of his countrymen, or that of their ancestors. That so many nations should have sacrificed, and, among them all no person should have detected this reason for the practice, especially when they were often pressed for some explanation of the rite, must, if it was still the true reason, remain, I suspect, a mystery.

Ninthly: A great part of the victims, offered in sacrifice, were burned.

A burnt victim, even in the eye of a savage, could neither satisfy a god, nor expiate a crime.

Tenthly: In an immense number of instances human victims were offered; and that from the remotest heathen antiquity.

Could even a savage hope to expiate the murder of one man by murdering another: i. e. could he form this hope, when contemplating the subject originally, before custom had given it a religious sanction?

4. Christians have believed sacrifices to have been instituted by God, immediately after the Apostasy, as types of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

In support of this opinion, beside the manner, in which it is affected by the preceding observations, and beside the consideration, that this is the only opinion remaining, it may be remarked,

First: That after the fall an atonement was announced.

All the Jewish sacrifices were typical of that atonement; and, by a parity of reasoning, all others were so. But, if they were thus typical, God instituted them; for in this view they could not have been devised by man.

Secondly: Here is a complete and solid reason for the practice; and the only reason, of any weight, which has been given.

Thirdly: The Jews had both this reason, and the institution itself, in their possession.

No other nation could give any reason for the custom; or any account of its origin.

Fourthly: Both the rite, and the manner of it, were common to nations, who neither did, nor could correspond with each other, after they became nations.

This proves a common origin: but no common origin was possible, beside a common ancestry.

I have now finished my remarks on this interesting subject. Should they be allowed to be just; it must also be allowed, that they furnish substantial evidence in support of Revelation in general, and of this history in particular.

REVIVAL OF RELIGION IN NEW-HAVEN.

THE following account of the late distinguished Revival of Religion in New-Haven, (Con.) was begun in a letter from a person resident there to his friend in a distant part of the United States. As the writer proceeded, he was induced to prepare the account for the *Panoplist*, leaving it still in the form of a letter. Of most of the facts here stated the writer was himself a witness; and details, with respect to the subject, only a small part of what he heard and saw. The remaining facts, are derived from the most authentic sources.

It is not possible that any narration of such events as the following, should be so interesting to the friends of religion, as it is to behold the events actually taking place. There are many reasons why this is the case; not the least of which is, that delicacy indispensably demands a suppression of names and personal circumstances, and forbids a complete developement of individual character. To be present during such a revival, therefore, affords to the candid mind more conclusive evidence of its reality, and gives more illustrious displays of Divine grace, than can be given in a written communication. A. B.

New-Haven, Jan. 1, 1810.

MY DEAR SIR,

You have heard of the uncommon and most desirable revival of religion, within the last two years, in this place; and in one of your letters, you have requested me to give you a more full and detailed account of it, than you had before that time received. To comply with your request will be a pleasing employment to me; and the facts themselves cannot but be gratifying to you.

A considerable number of professing Christians, who belong to

the two Congregational churches in New-Haven, have for many years anxiously desired, and prayed for, a revival of religion. A few, who belonged to the United Church, had been accustomed to meet once a week for the purpose of reading the Scriptures, religious conversation, and prayer for this specific object. Conferences had also been held, on Sunday evenings, by the pastor and members of the same church, and others who chose to attend, for two or three years before the commencement of the late revival. A considerable addition had been made to the number of communicants in the First Church, within a moderate period. There had been nothing, however, for a great length of time, which could justly be called a general attention to religion. The powerful and glorious work of God in Yale-College,* in the year 1802, made little impression upon the inhabitants of the town. The great body of the people had been in the habit of attending public worship on the Sabbath with decency and sobriety; but that earnestness to obtain eternal life, which afterwards appeared, and now exists, was not discoverable.

During the summer of 1807, it was more common to hear Christians express their wishes for a revival, and anticipate the

* This work, notwithstanding a few lamentable apostasies among the professed subjects of it, has proved itself, so far as an eight years trial can be admitted in evidence, to be an incalculable blessing. Not a few churches in our country are indebted to it for faithful and evangelical ministers.

blessed effects which would ensue from one, than it had been before that time. In the fall of that year, the two churches united in establishing a monthly prayer-meeting, at which the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit was the principal object for which supplication was offered.

About the same time, attempts were made to revive the discipline of the churches; and one of them proceeded so far as to deal with several offenders, who had for many years deserted the communion of their brethren, and been guilty of open immorality. In all these instances a happy result was experienced, and Christian watchfulness received an abundant reward, in the recovery of the wandering. One of the persons alluded to gave distinguished marks of penitence and gratitude; and the others afforded such evidence of a disposition to return to a course of duty, as was cheerfully accepted.

Sometime in December, conferences began to be held by the members of the First Church, many of whom had never before been present at meetings of this kind, and who had been prejudiced against them. As their opposition arose from erroneous views with respect to these meetings, it immediately ceased on attending them.

In January 1808, eleven persons were propounded, and admitted into one of the churches. This was quite an unusual number to be admitted at once, in this place. In the same month it was evident, that the minds of many were deeply affected with respect to religion. Serious things began to be a frequent

topic of conversation, and the pious had animating hopes, that the town was about to be blessed with a shower of Divine grace. This attention gradually, though rapidly, increased through the months of February and March, till in April a greater number were anxiously inquiring *what they should do to be saved*, than perhaps at any other time during the revival. This anxiety showed itself in a great variety of particulars.

The house of God was crowded on the Sabbath, during all the vicissitudes of weather and the seasons, in a manner altogether unprecedented. Nor was it crowded in vain. The most solemn and devout interest was taken in the prayers, the praises, and the preaching. While addressed from the pulpit, the hearers regarded Divine truth as we should naturally suppose beings would regard it, who *felt* that they had souls to be saved or lost forever. Tears were not unfrequent; a solemn stillness was unbroken, and universal.

Conferences were frequented on Sabbath evenings, and one evening of the week besides. As the season would not permit evening assemblies in the houses of public worship, it was found necessary to procure as large rooms as possible in private houses. Four of these rooms, all of which would contain five or six hundred persons, that is, between one and two hundred persons each, were regularly filled, and often excessively crowded. This was the case, even in very unpleasant and forbidding weather, so great and general was the desire to obtain knowledge

on sacred subjects, and to find a remedy for a wounded spirit.

Many small conferences were also held in private houses, wherever a few neighbors or friends were disposed to spend an evening in religious conversation, reading the Scriptures, and prayer. One of these small religious meetings was attended by ten or twelve young men, every Saturday evening, in a retired manner. They were all under deep impressions with respect to the state of their souls; and, it is believed, they derived essential advantages from the opportunities of free conversation, and appropriate prayer, which these meetings presented.

In the small conferences, that kind of freedom and familiarity of conversation was admitted, which is common on other solemn and important subjects; especially on subjects in which all are equally and deeply interested. But in the large conferences, greater reserve was maintained. The exercises were prayer, the singing of psalms and hymns, the reading of the Scriptures, and conversation upon those passages of Scripture which were read. Sometimes a sermon, or some other religious production, was read instead of the Scriptures. Those who took a part in the conversation, were generally men of some experience in religion, and of a good standing in society, and in the churches. A considerable proportion of them were persons of a liberal education who had, for years before, made religion a principal subject of their reading and reflections. The Clergymen always, of course, took the direction of these meetings, when

present, and, after expressing their own thoughts, were accustomed, if the time permitted, to call upon the brethren for further observations.

The preaching most liked by the people, and most effectual through the revival, was very remote from an address to the imagination or the passions. It aimed directly at the conscience and the understanding. No doubt it affected the passions in some degree; but it was through the medium of the understanding, and by the testimony of the conscience. It is, indeed, impossible, that interesting truths should have the effect for which they were designed, without touching the passions. Whatever is viewed by any man as supremely important, and as affecting his everlasting interests, must excite either hope, or fear. So true is this, that, whenever good men have any important object in view, they attempt to influence the passions by the forcible exhibition of truth to the understanding. Bad men, however, sometimes make an appeal to the passions without any aim at convincing the understanding, or enlightening the conscience.

But to return from this digression, the preaching, at the time I am describing, consisted principally, and so far as it was efficacious, of plain statements of the great truths of religion; such as the holiness of God, his hatred of sin, his veracity in his promises and threatenings, his sincerity in the offer of salvation, and in all his dealings with mankind, his unbounded love in providing a Savior for sinners, his sovereignty as displayed in the temporal and eternal allotments

of men; the atonement made for sin by the Divine Redeemer, and the necessity of that atonement; the deep, radical, and universal depravity of man; his natural hatred of truth, of holiness, and of God; the odiousness of sin; the need of a change of heart; the inseparable connexion between sin and misery; the impossibility of being happy, even in heaven, without conformity to God; the solemnities of the judgment-day, and its inconceivable consequences in the final states of the righteous and the wicked. These doctrines, and others connected with them, took deep hold of the conscience, and produced a correspondent anxiety with respect to the salvation of the soul.

As the revival increased, the attachment to the momentous truths above enumerated became stronger and more deeply fixed. Their intimate connexion with each other, and their agreement with the state of man and the plain declarations of the Bible, were clearly seen. Those who had their own hearts opened to their inspection, saw that depravity, the existence of which is so often denied by carnal men. They felt the need of that renovating power, which the Holy Spirit applies to the heart. They were convinced from their own experience, that without the restraining, preventing, converting, and sanctifying grace of God, they should be lost forever. Their own wants, sins, and miseries; their weakness and utter helplessness, caused them to value that system of religious truth which most exalts God and humbles the sinner. Any other system came infinitely short of

bringing a remedy suited to their case, and of affording a rational ground of hope.

In the conferences, religion was conversed about as a solemn subject interesting to all; the requirements of the Bible were represented as infinitely reasonable, proper, and glorious; sin was exhibited as the enemy of all enjoyment; and the necessity of attending immediately to the salvation of the soul was pressed upon the mind. These meetings were conducted with the utmost regularity and solemnity. Any disorder would have been as unexpected, and as heartily condemned, by those who attended them, as it would have been in any meeting that can be named.

At the beginning of the revival a few persons found it in their hearts to make bitter speeches on the subject; but their predictions of evil fell to the ground: and it is believed, on good reasons, that no event for many years has excited greater joy in the breasts of the religious community generally in New-Haven, and among the pious through a large vicinity.

The fruits of this revival have been such as to prove its character to be genuine. They may, without presumption, be described as the same fruits, to a very great and desirable extent, which the Apostle mentions, Gal. v, 22, 23. *But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.*

To be more particular, those who had been for a long time professors of religion in this town, felt much warmed, animated, and invigorated, by what was

passing before their eyes. They became more fervent in prayer, more watchful in their conduct, more deeply impressed with the value of the soul, more desirous of heaven. Their love for each other and for all Christians was surprisingly increased, as was perfectly evident to themselves, and to all around them. The members of the same church became more acquainted with each other, and took a much livelier interest in each other's welfare, than they had ever before done. They appeared, and felt, like brethren of the same family. They heartily congratulated each other on the enlivening prospect, and as heartily condemned and lamented their previous lukewarmness and negligence.

It may, also, be said with truth, that a beneficent spirit was very greatly increased in consequence of this revival. Two female charitable societies were formed in the winter and spring of 1808, both of which contained not less than 300 members. To these a third has since been added. The objects of these societies are to relieve the wants of distressed females, especially of female children, and to provide for the regular instruction of such of these children as have no other means of obtaining it. They were so happy as to obtain a pious and excellent woman for an instructor, by whose assiduous care a school containing twenty-four girls has been kept from the time when the societies were instituted. Here destitute female children have been formed to habits of neatness, and industry, and prepared so far as human caution can prepare, for lives of usefulness and virtue.

There is reason to believe, that parents have, in some instances, been led to reflection and some amendment, by the circumstance that their children are indebted to the benevolence of others for those benefits, which improvidence and vice had disabled themselves from affording.*

On the whole, I can say no less, than that the cause of religion has gained much strength by this gracious visitation. During the years 1808, and 1809, one hundred and forty persons made a public profession of religion and joined the First Church; more than one hundred and seventy, I think, joined the United Church after a similar profession; and twenty-five were added to the church in Yale-College. Beside these, many were awakened, and induced to inquire earnestly what they should do to be saved; a large proportion of whom, it is to be hoped, will have occasion to praise God through eternity for the impressions then received.

The converts were of all ages, and of all the variety of characters which the town contained. Old and young, the moral and the profane, the enlightened and the ignorant, those who were favorably inclined towards revivals of religion and those who were vehemently opposed to them, speculative believers and determined Infidels, the regular and the vicious, were among the

* Another female association has since been formed by young ladies in New-Haven, the object of which is the instruction of the female children of the blacks. For a brief notice of this, see the *Panoplist* for Oct. 1810, p. 222, in our Review of Dr. Dwight's Charity Sermon.

subjects of the work, and united most cordially in the reception and the profession of the same doctrines. They delighted in the same kind of preaching and united in seeking for happiness, whence alone it can be found, in the fa-

vor of God, as bestowed on man through the Divine Mediator.

With devout wishes for the prevalence of Christianity in our hearts, and lives, and among men universally,

I am affectionately yours,

*** **

REVIEW OF REVIEWS.

Review of Griesbach's New Testament.—Anthology for June, 1811.

WE are averse to disputation; and should not again occupy the attention of our readers, on the subject of those texts, the authenticity of which we have so lately examined, did we not suppose, that their importance will constitute a sufficient apology.

The Anthology for June last contains a defence of the Review of Griesbach, which had appeared in a previous number of that publication, and an attack on several things which we advanced in reviewing that Review. The importance of the subject has induced us to revise our own labors, and to consider what these critics have done to defend themselves, and to correct us.

In that part of the Review of Griesbach, which appeared in the Anthology for February last, we found the following sentences:

"To what is it to be attributed, that even at the present day, 1 John v, 7, is quoted in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, and even taken as a text of discourses; when it ought to be known, that it has not more authority in its favor, than the famous reading of the 7th commandment, in one of the editions of King James'

Bible; *thou shalt commit adultery.* The same may be said of Acts xx, 28, and 1 Tim. iii, 16; which ought to be no more quoted in their present form as proof passages, by any honest and well instructed theologian."

In our number for April last, after having quoted the foregoing words from the Anthology, we made the following statement:

"That a preponderating weight of evidence may at present exist against the genuineness of some of these texts, is what we do not intend to deny. That they, or any of them, have not more authority in their favor than the famous reading of the 7th commandment, in one of the editions of King James' Bible, *Thou shalt commit adultery,*' is an assertion which, we expect to shew, is neither well supported, nor very decorous." p. 507.

When we wrote our comments, we certainly did understand the Reviewers to mean as they said, although they now solemnly aver, that they meant no such thing.

"Now, our meaning was not," say they, "that *the same might be said* of the degree of authority of the received readings in Acts and Timothy, which could be said of the well-known interpolation of the *three heavenly witnesses*; this would have been too gross a misrepresentation of facts to have

been swallowed even by our friends; and, as we should have hoped, too gross, to be imputed to us even by enemies. Our meaning certainly was, that the texts in Acts and Timothy, were, *like that in John*, STILL QUOTED in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, and, as we thought, with great impropriety; and this was the only circumstance, in which we intended to represent them as in the same case. However; our words have appeared to convey another meaning, the very falsehood and rashness of which we hope will rescue us from the suspicion of having intended it. In the mean while, the sentence would have expressed the whole of our meaning, if it had read thus—'the same may be asked (i. e. to what is it to be attributed that they are still quoted) with respect to Acts xx, 28, and 1 Tim. iii, 16; which ought to be no more quoted in their present form as proof passages, by any honest and well instructed theologian.' " p. 404.

On this amendment we observe, in the first place, that it alters the very nature of the sentence which was the subject of our remarks. We have not, to be sure, been so deeply impressed with the erudition and accuracy of the writers in the Anthology, from any specimens of sacred criticism exhibited by them, as to feel it a duty not to admit that they could err, in these matters. If we understand their defence, however, it rests on this point; that the opinion conveyed by the language in their critique is so palpably erroneous, that it would be very uncivil and captious to attribute it to them. Yet, at the close of their defence, they say; "The unfortunate ambiguity of a passage in our review gave so fair an opportunity for the attack and the mode of attack in the Panoplist, that we have forborne to re-

taliate reproaches; and have neglected to notice all the occasions of censure and cavil, with which their attempt at criticism would have furnished us." p. 421. Themselves being judges, it is not, after all, a very strange thing, that we should have understood them as we did.

When we undertake to review any work, we review what is already published, and not what may be hereafter published by way of emendation. Whether these critics would have corrected their error, had it not been exposed, is a question which we are not called upon to determine. Of this we are sure, that there are great errors to be found in their pages, still unexplained and uncorrected; and if they are desirous of purging even their last volume of all misrepresentation, it will afford them no moderate employment. It is enough for us, however, that the part of their critique under consideration will bear no other sense than the one we gave it; that it is absolutely free from any ambiguity whatever; and that they themselves have confessed this, by awkwardly changing the very nature of the exceptionable sentence, in order to make it speak what they now say they meant.

As these gentlemen have been so civil as to give us an amended passage, it is no more than civil in us to consider it attentively.

We assert, therefore, in the second place, that the only effect of their emendation is to change a very plain passage into one a little ambiguous; not so ambiguous, however, but that most persons, in reading the amended

passage, would give it the same meaning which we gave to the original passage. To prove this assertion, let us analyse the sentence. The Reviewers ask, "To what is it to be attributed, that, even at the present day, 1 John v, 7, is quoted in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, and even taken as a text of discourses?" They then proceed to give a reason why their question is proposed, (a good reason, indeed, if it were true,) in the following words: "When it ought to be known, that it [the text referred to] has not more authority, than the famous reading, &c." They next ask a second question, in the amended passage, thus: "The same may be asked with respect to Acts xx, 28, and 1 Tim. iii, 16." But for this question they give no reason, though they follow it up with a very strong conclusion in these words: "Which [the two latter texts] ought to be no more quoted in their present form, &c." Now, we ask whether an intelligent reader would not naturally apply the same reason to both questions? The questions are exactly the same; one of them is followed by a reason amply sufficient to account for proposing it; the other is followed by no reason, but instead of a reason there comes a conclusion as strong as the one intended to be drawn from the first question, and the reason which is appended to it. To make our meaning more clear, if possible, we will construct a sentence on another subject, as nearly as practicable like the one we are examining. Suppose the following passage were found in a political paper: "To what is it to be attributed,

that A. B. is still appointed to high offices, and occupies stations of great responsibility; when it ought to be known, that he is as utterly destitute of any qualification for public employment, as the most ignorant and unprincipled felon, who is confined within the walls of our prisons. The same may be asked with respect to C. D. and E. F. who ought not hereafter to be considered as candidates for office, by any honest and well instructed citizen." We only inquire whether C. D. and E. F. would not have occasion to complain, especially if they were good and honest men, of being compared to "an ignorant and unprincipled felon." Unless we are greatly mistaken, we have known at least one case of a libel in this country, in which the connexion between the libellous matter and the injured party was less intimate, than that between the reason subjoined to the first question, and the parties implicated in the second; and yet two juries, under the direction of a very enlightened court, did not hesitate to give exemplary damages. After what has been said, should any of our readers disagree with us, as to the intimacy of this connexion, we presume all will admit, that the passage, even as amended, is either plainly contrary to what the Reviewers declare to have been their meaning, or, at the best, only ambiguous.

But on the supposition, that the original passage had been at first clearly understood as its authors have since explained it, in the long paragraph cited from page 404; still it would do them no honor as critics. In that case, they place themselves in the

chair of sacred criticism, and pronounce very dogmatically, that two important texts must henceforth be excluded from authentic Scripture; and all this without assigning, or even hinting at, any reason for this exclusion. For let it be observed, if they did 'not mean that the same could be said of the degree of authority of the received readings' in Acts, Timothy, and John, then they did not express *any* meaning with respect to the authority of the texts in Acts and Timothy. In other words, they did not impeach the authority of these two texts, but proscribed them without giving a shadow of a reason, or even hinting that there was a reason in existence; and what is somewhat singular, they do this immediately after having excluded another text, for which exclusion they have given a reason abundantly sufficient, provided it were true. This certainly is not a natural manner of writing: whether it is a dignified style of criticism, let the public judge.

On the whole, we cannot but think, that the Anthology Reviewers were singularly unfortunate in the first construction of the obnoxious sentence; that their attempts at emendation do not quite suit the exigencies of the case; and that the sentence must again be applied to the torture, and perhaps have every joint dislocated, before it will speak their meaning.

As to the disputed text in John, they say,

"Whether the *authority* of the text in John is a little more, or a little less, than that of the curious error in King James' Bible, we are not solicitous

to show; it is enough to justify the comparison, that the text of the heavenly witnesses is not found in a single Greek M S. written before the invention of printing, and has been established in our Bibles by a series of frauds and mistakes." p. 405.

That is, 'whether our assertion was a *little more or a little less*, compatible with the real state of the fact, is a subject of no solicitude to us. If no M S. before the invention of printing contains the disputed verse, and frauds and mistakes have been committed in establishing it in our Bibles,' (which, by the way, these gentlemen have not been pleased to prove,) 'it follows, that we are justified in saying, that the passage has *not more* authority, than the curious error in King James' Bible.' This is undeniably a fair statement of their meaning.

For ourselves, we are not at all satisfied with an explanation of an absolute and unqualified assertion, on a subject of great moment, which explanation amounts to nothing more than that the authors of the assertion are not solicitous to show, whether it be a little more or a little less compatible with the fact. Nor, if we should allow all which they assert respecting the authority and establishment of the controverted verse, with regard to MSS. and frauds, and mistakes, would the state of the evidence, taking the whole into consideration according to the rules of sober criticism, warrant them in speaking as they have done, and as they persist in doing.

Indeed, we are of opinion, that the worst enemy of the Anthology Reviewers would not wish them to be judged more

severely, than they must be judged by every candid man, who attentively considers all that they have said on this text. After four months had elapsed from the publication of their first critique, and they had been furnished with abundant reasons for explaining a rash and unfounded assertion, they deliberately make the following declaration: "Till this be done," (i. e. 'till some one of several questions proposed by them shall be fairly answered by the Panoplist,') "we shall continue "to speak as contemptuously as we have done" on the subject of this verse, without any "trembling solicitude" for our own reputation." p. 418.

The "trembling solicitude," by the way, to which they here refer, and which we had recommended, (Panoplist for April, p. 514,) was intended by us to regard a very different subject from that of their reputation, or the reputation of any man. It was considered by us as a very proper state of mind to be preserved by those who meddle with sacred criticism, in order to deter from a rash, audacious, and profane manner of treating the oracles of God; and we are now more than ever convinced, that these Reviewers would lose nothing that is valuable by the cultivation of this kind of "trembling solicitude."

But let us attend briefly to their admissions with respect to this verse.

1. They allow, that it "has been established in our Bibles." True, they add, "by a series of frauds and mistakes;" but these frauds and mistakes are to be proved; while the 'establishment

of the text in our Bibles' is known to every man. This 'establishment' is a fact of no less consequence, than that nearly all the Greek and Latin Bibles used by the learned in Europe since the invention of printing, have contained the verse; and nearly all the Latin Bibles for several centuries before. It is also found in the translations into the vernacular tongues of Europe, and has been received as Holy Scripture by a great majority of Christians from the time the Epistle was written to the present day. Whether it is decent to compare this verse, thus received and revered by the Christian world, with the 7th commandment so glaringly misprinted, as that every child of common understanding would instantly detect the error, and so plainly falsified, as that no human being probably ever received it as Scripture, let the candid judge.

2. Charles Butler, Esq. is allowed by these Reviewers to be a "scholar" and a man "of learning and candor," (p. 416,) and yet they themselves represent him as 'reluctant to give up the text.' They do not pretend, as plainly they cannot, that he is ignorant of the controversy, or that he is deficient in any of the means of information which themselves possess. We shall not be contradicted when we add, that he is a man of uncommon ability, sagacity, and industry. Was it ever known, that a man possessed of all these excellent qualities, ever believed that the seventh commandment should read, *Thou shalt commit adultery?*

3. Dr. Middleton is also allowed to be a "scholar," (p. 416,)

and to have written an "elaborate work on the Greek article." (p. 418.) Yet he strenuously contends for the verse in question. These Reviewers state, that they "are by no means competent to judge of Middleton's theory;" much less do they feel able to refute it; though they are "much inclined to suspect, that the argument from the African Confession, and from the use of the Greek article, which Messrs. Butler and Middleton seem disposed to maintain, will share the same fate with Stephens' semi-circle, &c." (p. 416.) That is, they are inclined to suspect that this argument will be answered some time or other, by somebody or other, though they cannot precisely tell how, or when, or by whom. Whether they are the inventors of this mode of getting rid of an argument we know not; it is certainly, however, a very expeditious mode; and a very capital excellence which it possesses is, that it is equally fit for all occasions, times, and circumstances. Let no one hereafter despond in controversy; but when hard pressed by an argument let the anxious disputant remember to say, with a confident air, "This argument will be answered in future, as other arguments have been answered heretofore."

4. These very Reviewers take up several pages in arguing against the genuineness of the text in dispute. Why argue so laboriously in so plain a case? Whoever thought of *proving* that the word *not* should be preserved in the seventh commandment?

5. But the most remarkable thing of all is, that these gentlemen have twice, in this very dis-

cussion, admitted that there is *some* probability in favor of the very passage, which they had exploded from the Sacred Canon with such marked indignity and contempt. Hear their words: "We were not ignorant of what had been said on this text, by both these modern scholars; but notwithstanding the opinion of the Quarterly Reviewers, and of the Panoplist itself, we are not sure, that any increase of probability has been gained for this interpolation." p. 416. They are *not* sure, that any *increase of probability* has been gained! Very well. But, before they used the contemptuous language on which we animadverted, they ought to have been sure, that there was *not* any increase of probability in favor of the verse; and further, that there was *no probability* to be the subject of *increase*. As it is, they have admitted a probability in favor of the passage, even before the arguments of Mr. Butler and Dr. Middleton were published; or else the sentence above quoted is flat nonsense.

Again; after arguing on this text at considerable length, they say; "In any case, it ought not to be forgotten, that it is far *more* probable, that the article and the clause in the 8th verse are *spurious*, than that the 7th is *genuine*." p. 420. Here we find them talking about *probability*, as applicable to the *genuineness* of this identical seventh verse. In short, their management of this discussion is fitted only to confound probability and certainty, and to destroy all the ordinary distinctions with respect to evidence. While admitting the candor and learning of Mr. But-

ler, and the scholarship of Dr. Middleton; while laboriously arguing to *prove* the controverted passage to be spurious; while incautiously allowing *some probability* to exist in favor of the passage; they start up in the same breath, and exclaim, "*We shall continue to speak as contemptuously as we have done on the subject of this verse.*" Who can hesitate hereafter to place implicit confidence in the decisions of the Anthology?

Before we leave this subject, it is proper to state, that the ablest and the wisest critics, among those who have been inclined to reject the verse under consideration, have given their opinion and their reasons with becoming gentleness and moderation. They have considered the matter as in some measure doubtful, and as being a proper subject of future inquiry. How great a proportion of candid examiners have been disposed, during the last twenty years, to give up the verse in question, we have no adequate means of determining. We feel authorized to say, however, that there are, and ever have been, on both sides of the Atlantic, men of talents, learning, candor, and ingenuousness, who still adhere to the received reading.* But to proceed:

The Anthology Reviewers profess their great surprise at "the unusual *et alage* of erudition" exhibited in the Panoplist, and say, they "could not account

for this unusual phenomenon of criticism," till they found "almost the whole" of it, in "the eighth volume of the Christian Observer." p. 407.

A stranger to the Panoplist would naturally suppose, from this representation, that we had been making a display of erudition, for which we had not acknowledged ourselves to be indebted, and the whole credit of which we were desirous of arrogating to ourselves. Our readers have not forgotten, however, that we made the following statement at the close of the examination of the three texts, in the Panoplist for May, p. 544.

"From Middleton the substance of what we have said on the article is taken. From the sixth and eighth volumes of the Christian Observer, and from Griesbach, are taken all our authorities respecting the three texts, whose authenticity we have examined. In several places where the brevity of the passage made it practicable, we have copied verbatim the words of the Christian Observer. In others, we have endeavored to preserve the substance of those candid and able examinations of the controverted verses, which the volumes cited of that admirable work contain."

We cannot doubt, (we wish we could) that the Anthology Reviewers intended to fix upon us the charge of plagiarism, and thus to prejudice the minds of their readers against us. This is an act so exceedingly disingenuous, that it needs no comment. From the manner in which the subject is introduced, and from all that is said upon it, the reader would conclude, that these Reviewers had made a fortunate discovery of the aid which the Christian Observer had af-

*Since writing the above, we have observed that Dr. Buchanan gives his opinion in favor of the genuineness of this text; though he did not find it in any Syriac copy in the East. See Christian Researches, p. 250, Camb. Ed.

forded us; certainly no one would imagine, that we had stated, fully and fairly, the use which we had made of that able publication.

We should be gratified if the Reviewers would undertake to prove the consistency of the following charges in the article we are examining.

"From the tone of assurance in which the Panoplist reviewer expresses his great estimation of the large critical edition, we were led to suppose that he knew something about it; and that he had taken the pains to examine Griesbach's authorities with relation to the texts in question; but we soon found that (notwithstanding the great outcry made about "resting faith on the *ipse dixit* of another") he takes every thing as he finds it in the Christian Observer. Such are the critics, who say "we wish access and to satisfy us at all, we *must have access* to the authorities by which Griesbach himself professes to regulate his opinions." " p. 407.

"We have said, that the Christian Observer is made use of, with such omissions and alterations, as suit the purpose of the reviewer." p. 411.

Now, whether '*taking every thing as he finds it in the Christian Observer,*' and '*making use of the Christian Observer with such omissions and alterations, as suit the purpose of the Reviewer,*' are charges "*a little more or a little less*" consistent with each other, is probably what certain gentlemen may not be "solicitous to show." Why did they not, instead of making these contradictory assertions, prove, either that we had followed the Christian Observer without examination, or differed from it without reason or authority?

But we are not principally concerned to notice things of

this nature. We are accused of advancing charges against Griesbach, which we have not supported. This is more important. We have re-examined the subject, and shall proceed to detail the evidence respecting it.

The Reviewers introduce and support their first charge against us, in the following manner:

"One of the proofs of G's inaccuracy is thus stated from the Christian Observer. "Griesbach says, that the reading (the church of the Lord and God, Acts xx, 28,) is in the Arabic Polyglot; but this is an error. The reading of that version is *the Lord God.*" Now, Griesbach in his note on this verse expressly quotes the Arabic of the Polyglot for the various reading *Κυρις Θες*, and does not quote it for the reading *Κυρις και Θες*; as any one may see, who will consult his large critical edition, vol. ii, p. 113. Who is here in an error? (What the Arabic Polyglot is, the gentlemen will no doubt tell us when they have found it.)" p. 407.

The charge against us is, that we have represented Griesbach as saying, that the reading of *the church of the LORD AND GOD* is in the Arabic (Polyglot.) The affirmation is, that "he does not quote it [this version] for the reading *Κυρις και Θες*. The dispute is easily settled. "*E præstantissimis nullus, e reliquis, passim bonas vetustasque lectiones exhibentibus, vix unus et alter (velut 26. 27. 29. 31. Mt. 1.) legit Κυρις και Θες. Versio nulla huic lectioni patrocinator, præter Arabicam Polyglottorum, &c.*" (Gries. Nov. Test. vol. ii, p. 115.) The author is producing his arguments against the authenticity of the reading *the Lord and God*. His second argument is in the words just quoted, which in En,

glish stand thus: "Of the best (MSS.) none, of others, which here and there exhibit good and ancient readings, very few (as 26. 27. &c.) read *Κυρις και Θες*, (*the Lord and God.*) No version favors *this* reading, *except* the *Arabic of the Polyglot.*" What room there is here for the absolute assertion, that Griesbach "does not quote it" [the Arab. Pol.] for the reading *Κυρις και Θες*, and what occasion there is for the triumph manifested in the succeeding interrogatory, "Who is here in an error?" the public may now judge.

An obscure notice, introduced by way of note in this place, informs the reader, that these Reviewers "do not know how to reconcile" Griesbach's authorities with a certain passage beginning with "*Versio nulla*, &c.," and, at the same time, exhibits the straits to which they were reduced to maintain their assertion, and to defend the immaculate correctness of Griesbach. On the one hand, after having more than once insinuated that we had never read Griesbach, it would not do to neglect this unlucky passage of *Versio nulla*, as such a neglect would subject themselves to a similar imputation. On the other, it would not do to produce the passage at length, because this would directly contradict the affirmation which had been made, and wipe away the contempt which they meant to fix upon us by their triumphant question. What remained but to steer dexterously between Scylla and Charybdis? Who among their readers would take the pains to turn over Griesbach, and see what that obscure *versio nulla*, &c. meant, when they, with all their critical pers-

picacity, were not able to reconcile the passage with the authorities? And who would not credit their triumphant declaration, that the Panoplist had erred in this matter?

We see no way in which the Reviewers will escape from this transaction without disgrace. They may allege their affirmation to have been, that Griesbach has not *quoted* erroneously. If they place any emphasis on the technical meaning of this word, it does not meet the allegation of the Panoplist, which is, "Griesbach *says* &c." After all, we grant that Griesbach has "*quoted*" the Arabic (Polyglot) for the reading *Κυρις Θες*, (*Lord God*) in page 113. And what does this prove? that our charge against him of inaccuracy in some instances is not substantiated? The very reverse. It proves, that in the very same discussion, and at the distance of no more than two pages, he has quoted an authority in favor of one reading, which in an important argument he produces in favor of a *diverse* reading. Whoever can vindicate this from error will do wonders.

The second charge against us is as follows:

"The next attempt to convince Griesbach of a mistake is found in this passage: "Among the versions, which have *the Church of the Lord*, Griesbach is disposed to rank the *Ethiopic*, because that version generally agrees with the Armenian and the Coptic, which exhibit this reading; and because the Ethiopic word here used (*egziabeher*) is employed to express both *Κυρις* and *Θεος*. Griesbach says, that this word is *always* employed in rendering both these Greek words. *But this is a mistake; and the conclusion built upon it may therefore be unsound.*" " p. 407.

Respecting this statement, the Reviewers observe,

"He (*Griesbach*) does not say, that the Ethiopic *always employs the same word* in rendering both *Kυριος* and *Θεος*; i. e. as these gentlemen would make him say, that this version *invariably renders Kυριος*, wherever it occurs, by *egziabeher*." p. 408.

Our dispute here will not be long. Speaking of Acts xx, 28, *Griesbach*, after having referred to MSS. and versions, which support the reading of *the Church of God*, says, "*Æthiops habet vocabulum, quo SEMPER utitur, sive Θεος in Græca veritate legitur, sive Kυριος*;" i. e. "The Ethiopic (translator) has the word (*egziabeher*) which he *always* uses, whether *Θεος* (God) or *Kυριος* (Lord) be the reading of the original Greek." The Latin sentence above quoted the Reviewers themselves have laid before their readers. The whole controversy, on this point, is simply whether *semper* means *always*, or not. Now we assert, that the phrase *quo semper utitur* is correctly translated *which he always uses*; which, indeed, the Reviewers admit in the following very curious sentence:

"All that *Griesbach* says is, that the Ethiopic translator has, in this verse, a word which he continually employs (*quo semper utitur*) in rendering both *Kυριος* and *Θεος*: that is, as we understand him, not every where and without exception, but (according to a natural and common meaning of *semper*) *perpetually, usually*, in the same way we use the adverb, *always*, in English." p 408.

We represented *Griesbach* as in an error, when he affirms of the Ethiopic version, that it *al-*

ways employs the same word in translating both *Θεος* and *Kυριος*. The Reviewers have conceded, that this version does *not* uniformly employ the same word in translating these two Greek words. They have then attempted to convict us of misrepresentation; and, in this attempt, they have stated, that *Griesbach* *does* say, that the Ethiopic "*perpetually, always*," employs the same word. We are not yet able to see how we have erred in this matter.

One thing is clear; whatever sense the word *semper* may occasionally have, on account of its peculiar connexion, the natural, usual, and almost (if not quite) universal meaning, is that which we have attached to it. The least that can possibly be said, then, is, that *Griesbach*, in a plain case, where pressed by no difficulty of composition or construction, has used a Latin word liable to be universally misunderstood, and, according to the best Latin authorities, necessarily conveying a meaning different from what he intended to express. This is a charge which these Reviewers would be as little disposed to admit, as the other. However, we are under no apprehensions, that any man, after a fair statement, will understand *Griesbach* differently from what we did; nor do we suppose that the Reviewers themselves can doubt, or ever could, that we correctly understood, and faithfully translated, his assertion.

We do not, as seems to be intimated, assert, that the conclusion made by *Griesbach*, from the agreement of the Coptic and Armenian versions, and from the

word *cgziabeher*, that the Greek copy used by the Ethiopic translator probably read *Kyrios*, is false. We only say, "it *may* be unsound." This cannot be denied.

What reason the Reviewers have to conclude this part of their critique in the following strain, we are willing the public should decide without any comment of ours.

"We only say, that here ends the semblance of an attempt to show, that Griesbach has made some mistakes. That inaccuracies have crept into so large a work may be previously supposed; but that this writer has supported his charge, no one we imagine will believe but himself. It requires something more than a study of the *Christian Observer* to show this "satisfactorily;" and it would not be amiss before attempting it again, to pay a little attention to Griesbach itself, which it is easier to praise, or to blame, than to study." p. 410.

The next accusation is generally stated thus:

"In giving a summary of the authorities of the Fathers under the former text, the Panoplist reviewer had nothing to do but to transcribe from his original; but here not having the work done to his hands, he has undertaken to make the summary himself; in which there are about as many mistakes, or misrepresentations, as there are lines. He says the Apostolical Constitutions have clearly quoted the text in question with *Θεός*. Now any one who reads the extract either in Griesbach, or the *Christian Observer*, may satisfy himself that *Θεός* is not *quoted* there at all. The same may be said of Lactantius. The reviewer does not seem to understand the difference between a clear quotation of a passage, and the use of some of the words contained in a passage." pp. 410, 411.

This respects 1 Tim iii, 16. We have only to produce our authorities. Apostolical Constitutions, vii, 26, "*Θεός Κυρίε, ὁ ἐπιφάνεισ ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ σαρκί.*" i. e. "Lord God, who didst appear, (or wast manifested, *ἐπιφάνεισ part. pass. 2 aor.*) to us in the flesh."

We believe this to be a clear quotation; the Reviewers do not; let the public decide. If it be not a *clear* quotation, it is so very like one, that we should be gratified with some other proof of the negative than mere assertion.

But the Reviewers, in the paragraph quoted, proceed thus: "The same may be said of Lactantius," (i. e. that *Θεός* is not *quoted* by him at all,) as "any one who reads the extract either in Griesbach, or the *Christian Observer*, may satisfy himself." We are not able to find, that Griesbach has quoted, or in any way referred to, Lactantius, on the verse in question. How we are to satisfy ourselves, then, by 'reading the extract in Griesbach,' that Lactantius has not *quoted* the controverted word, we cannot divine. There seems to be something quite unfortunate for the Reviewers in this "*Same may be said*;" and, if we might be permitted to give a gentle hint upon the occasion, we should advise them, the next time they introduce this favorite expression, to stop a little, and first inquire, *what* may be said.

The quotation from Lactantius, in the *Christian Observer*, is as follows: "Lactantius (305) iv, 25, says; The Mediator came, that is, God in the flesh." The original runs thus: Lactantius is assigning the reasons of

the Mediator's incarnation. He had just been saying, "*Fuit igitur et Deus et homo, inter Deum atque hominem medius constitutus, ut hominem perducere ad Deum posset; quia si Deus tantum fuisset, exempla virtutis homini præbere non posset; si homo tantum, non posset homines ad justitiam cogere, &c.*" After two sentences of further explanation, he adds, "*Idcirco Mediator advenit, id est, Deus in carne.*" For the sake of the English reader we translate the passage: "He was, therefore, both God and man, a constituted medium between God and man, that he might bring man to God; for if he had been God only, he could not have exhibited examples of virtue to man; if he had been man only, he could not have brought men to a state of justification, &c. Therefore he came as Mediator, that is, God in the flesh."

We believe, that Lactantius clearly referred here to the form of expression in 1 Tim. iii, 6; the Reviewers do not; let the reader judge.

The next proof, that we have made "about as many mistakes, or misrepresentations as there are lines," is thus brought forward:

"He says, that Gregory Nyssen quotes Θεός "very clearly." Griesbach asserts the very contrary. "Atque huc referendus (that is, to the class of those who have been improperly or doubtfully quoted for Θεός) esse videtur Gregorius Nyss. cui editores quidem attribuunt Θεός εφανερώθη, qui vero, &c. Itaque ὁ legisse videtur, aut etiam ὁ." p. 411.

Let us consider the testimony. We have not the original at hand; but give the exact translation of it from the Christian Ob-

server. In book 10th against Eunomius, Gregory Nyssen says of Paul; "He not only calls Christ God, but also the great God, and God over all; saying in his Epistle to the Romans, 'Whose are the fathers, and of whom Christ came according to the flesh, who is God over all, blessed for ever;' and to Titus, 'Waiting for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ'; and to Timothy expressly, 'God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the spirit!'" This we all call a *very clear* quotation by Gregory Nyssen.

What, then, if 'Griesbach does assert the very contrary?' It only furnishes an additional demonstrative proof of the charges we have brought against him. For we presume, that no man who reads the above quotation will doubt, that Gregory quotes the passage in question. There is not a more decisive quotation, in all the Fathers from Clemens Romanus down to Theophylact.

From the representation of the Reviewers, it would appear that Griesbach had made his assertion, with regard to the same passage in Gregory which is brought forward in the Christian Observer. It escaped our censors, however, that Griesbach pronounces his judgment on a sentence of Gregory quoted from his *Antirrhēt. adv. Apollinar.* p. 138; which passage is το μυστηριον εν σαρκι εφανερωθη; and that the Christian Observer quotes Gregory's *tenth book against Eunomius*. We say it escaped them; for if it did not, there is a dishonesty in what they have done, which it is not necessary for us to characterize.

But what becomes of the accuracy of Griesbach, in this view of the matter? He has placed Gregory Nyssen, and that without the least notice that his works any where contain any thing *decided* on the subject, among that class of writers, whose reference to the passage in question is doubtful. The fact is altogether the reverse. Thus much for this "misrepresentation."

The remaining proofs of "misrepresentation" are thus expressed:

"The reviewer then proceeds to mention Ignatius, Hippolytus, and Basil, as having "probably" quoted Θεός in this controverted text; a representation which is not justified even by the statements of his great authority, the Christian Observer." p. 411.

The quotations are these: Ignatius, Epist. ad Ephes. §19, says, "Θεὸς ἀνθρωπίνως φανερωμένος εἰς καὶνότητά αἰδὶς ζωῆς—God being manifested in the human form for the renovation of everlasting life."

Hippolytus, c. Noet. 17, "Οὗτος προελθὼν εἰς κόσμον, Θεὸς ἐν σώματι ἐφανερώθη—He who came into the world was manifested God in a body."

Basil, Epist. 65. "Τὰ μεγάλῃς μυστηρίῃς, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί—Of the great mystery, that the Lord was manifested in the flesh."

Our readers will see, that, with respect to Basil, we were mistaken. From his quotation it cannot be determined how he read the passage. The mistake occurred in the haste of compilation; and we gladly correct it. Our opinion of the two former quotations has by no means changed.

The Reviewers say, that we do not seem to "understand the difference between a clear quotation of a passage, and the use of some of the words contained in a passage." If this means, that we do not in every instance judge as they do, we have nothing to reply.

With respect to the use we made of the Christian Observer, it is only necessary to add to what has been said above, that we made no professions of following it in every, the minutest, particular; nor can any thing be produced, in which we did not act agreeably to our professions, and to the practice of respectable writers, when they are professedly abridging and compiling from the materials of others.

We have read "even the preface to the *manual edition*," (Anthol. p. 414) and carefully examined the attempt made by the Reviewers to explain away difficulties; but are not yet satisfied respecting the manner of printing Θεός in this edition.

We stated in our number for April, that the American edition had no mark prefixed to Θεός indicating the value of that reading. This raised a doubt whether it were accurate here; for Griesbach had, in 1806, published his critical edition, in which he has prefixed a mark to this word shewing that it is a probable reading; whereas the *manual*, from which the Cambridge edition is copied, bears date in 1805. The conclusion we drew from these circumstances, was, either that an important mark had been omitted in reprinting the manual edition, or that Griesbach himself had been in a vacillating state, deciding one year in one

way, and the next year another.

The Reviewers assure us, that no mistake has been made, with respect to this passage, in copying the German original. Then to show that this edition, although dated a year before the critical edition, is really later as to compilation, they state the following facts: 'That the book of Acts, (crit. edit.) was printed in 1799; and that the Catholic Epistles had been sent to the printer, before Griesbach had received White's edition of the Philoxenian version, which was published in 1800.' Hence they conclude, "that the greater part of the 2nd vol. was printed long before the manual edition, and therefore the latter has every claim to be considered as containing the last results of Griesbach's studies." But the conclusion does not follow from the premises. It is far from certain, that Griesbach received White's edition as soon as it was published. The Reviewers are not quite accurate in saying, 'the Catholic Epistles had been sent to the printer;' though that is nothing to the present argument. Griesbach's words are "*maxima etiam Catholicarum Epistolarum pars*," &c. To be brief, all the satisfactory information which they have collected on this subject of dates, is contained in the passage which they have translated from the preface to the Cambridge edition; and what is said at the close of this passage strongly inclines us to believe, that the text in question was actually printed later in the critical, than in the manual, edition. Griesbach says, "I have concluded to publish, in the mean while, the first volume

embracing the four Gospels, and the former section of the second volume, containing all Paul's Epistles; and the remainder will appear as soon as possible with the 2nd vol. of the *Editio Hulen-sis*, and the rest of Goschen's splendid work." We think it pretty clear from what is here said, that the 2nd vol. of the critical edition was published after Paul's Epistles in the manual. Can it be credited for a moment, that, according to the supposition of the Reviewers, nearly the whole of the 2nd large vol. of the critical edition should have been printed six years, or thereabouts, before it was published? Can it be credited, we mean, without some direct evidence; for though it is very possible, it is still most improbable, and not to be believed upon mere conjecture. Whatever may be the fact, it is by no means proved as yet, that the small edition "has every claim to be considered as containing the last results of Griesbach's studies."

As to the examination which the Reviewers have given Mr. Butler's letter, we have only a word to say. It by no means follows, because this gentleman is a Catholic, and biassed in favor of the Vulgate, (of which, by the way, we have seen no proof,) that his arguments are of no value. Nor do the questions, proposed by the Reviewers, involve any other difficulties than attend the record of innumerable facts by the Fathers, and other ancient writers. If any one wishes to ascertain this, let him consult *Daille de usu Patrum*, and *Whitby's Examen*.

With respect to the argument from the article, as stated by Dr.

Middleton, we are satisfied with the concessions of the Reviewers, that they "are by no means competent to judge of Middleton's theory."

As they have also conceded the correctness of that principle of the Greek language, which we had occasion to examine, when treating of the punctuation of Heb. i, 8, it is unnecessary to say any thing further on that subject.

They endeavor to excuse Griesbach's punctuation, in this place, by saying, that he pointed the passage according to the Septuagint, from which it is quoted, and in which it has never been made to appear in the vocative by means of commas. These gentlemen doubtless know, if they know any thing about the Septuagint, that neither the vocative of Θεός, nor any other vocative, is separated by commas, in the older editions. At least we are not able to find a single instance of such separation, though a multitude of examples of the contrary occur on the slightest inspection. But lately it is the custom, we believe, of all correct European presses, to insulate the vocative; and Griesbach, by not inserting commas on each side of Θεός, intended to represent this word as being in the nominative: so, at least, he was understood by these Reviewers, as appears in their number for February, p. 113. The excuse therefore amounts to nothing.

The Reviewers say, p. 411, "It is very easy to see, that all the solicitude is lest the texts should be given up;" and they have an insinuation to the same effect, in a Latin quotation, p.

416. Such things are said without much expense of invention or argument. How came these gentlemen to select these texts in the first instance, and to make them the subject of such decisive animadversion?

We have now discussed all the charges brought against us by these Reviewers in their last critique on Griesbach, and all the prominent considerations they have offered in his vindication; with what success others must determine. Of this we are sure, that with respect to the present controversy, and every other which we have had with these gentlemen, we feel no apprehension from the sentence of those who consider temperately, and decide conscientiously. This article has been made longer than we could have wished, partly by the variety of subjects drawn into dispute, and partly by the quotations from the Anthology, which were deemed necessary to give a fair view of what had been said by our opponents.

There are two short passages, in the critique we are examining, which demand a moment's distinct consideration. We have already quoted them both; but in company with so many other things, that they may not have excited much attention.

After stating that their 'meaning was not that the *same might be said* of the degree of authority of the texts in Acts and Timothy which could be said of the text in John,' they add; "This would have been too gross a misrepresentation of facts to have been swallowed even by our friends." p. 404. Are we to infer from this, that, according to the calculation of these gentlemen,

"a mirepresentation of facts," may be expected to 'be swallowed by their friends,' and even 'a gross misrepresentation,' provided it be not "*too gross*?" This is a question to be settled between themselves and their friends; and as we shall not be allowed to rank among the latter, we shall decline giving an opinion. Should the inference be legitimate, however, it will assist in accounting for certain confident assertions to be found in their pages.

The remaining passage is as follows: "The unfortunate ambiguity of a passage in our review gave so fair an opportunity for the attack and the mode of attack in the *Panoplist*, that we have forborne to retaliate reproaches; and have neglected to notice all the occasions of censure and cavil, with which their attempt at criticism would have furnished us." p. 421. Wonderful *forbearance*, indeed, *that* must be, which a consideration of their own gross blunder, (to use the mildest name,) has induced them to exercise, and which consists simply in not '*retaliating reproaches*!' But further. They "have neglected to

notice *all* the occasions of censure and *cavil*, with which" they had been furnished.* It seems, then, that they have noticed *some* of these occasions. We should have been glad if they had designated those parts of their last review which come under the head of "*censure*," and those which, in their own opinion, are "false or frivolous objections," as Dr. Johnson defines "*cavil*." It might have saved us some trouble; as it would not have been expected, that we should refute those things, which the objectors themselves had described as no better than cavil. Though they have not done this, we are still under obligations to them which ought to be acknowledged. On account of 'the unfortunate ambiguity of a passage in their review,' an ambiguity which they begin their reply by "lamenting," p. 404, they are willing, as a generous set-off, not to use against us *all* the occasions of censure and *cavil*, of which they would otherwise have availed themselves. We must be very ungrateful not to feel the generosity of such forbearance from reproaches, and such abstinence from censure and cavil!

*The sentence on which we are commenting, is, as we perceive on a repeated reading, a little ambiguous. Taken by itself, it might mean, that its authors "had *utterly* neglected to notice occasions of censure and cavil;" but this meaning is not the natural one; and, besides, it is so palpably contrary to the fact, that it cannot have been the meaning intended. Indeed, the Reviewers would by no means acknowledge, that they had written nineteen pages against us, without noticing an occasion of *censure*.

REVIEWS.

XVIII. *A Sermon delivered at the Ordination of the REV. JOHN BARTLETT to the pastoral care of the Second Church in Marblehead, 22d May, 1811. By ABIEL HOLMES, D. D. Pastor of the First Church in Cambridge. Cambridge: Hilliard and Metcalf. pp. 46.*

SCARCELY any occasion can be conceived more solemn and momentous, than that of an *ordination*. The office of a Minister directly involves the interests of the Christian Church on earth, and has a near relation to the scene of final judgment. Sermons on such occasions ought to correspond with the nature and object of the sacred office. Equally distant from the warmth and rancor of controversy, the abstraction of metaphysical discussion, and the coldness of moral essay, they should be adapted to affect the hearts of ministers *with the magnitude of their duties, and to rouse them to every effort of pastoral love and fidelity*. Though ordination sermons may comprise a great variety of topics, they ought to have a tendency to this great end. Such a tendency the sermon before us obviously has. The disclosure of evangelical truth and ministerial duty, which it contains, must have been interesting both to ministers and people. The author's design is to show, *what the Gospel is, who are set for its defence, and by what means it is to be defended*. Viewing this sermon in the light of criticism merely, we think that simplicity and unity would

have been better preserved by the omission of the second head. To describe the nature of the Gospel and the proper means of defending it may consist with unity of design; especially if one of these be made the grand object, and the other subservient to it. But when, in addition to the nature of the Gospel, and the various means proper to be used in its defence, the preacher undertakes distinctly to point out the necessary qualifications of ministers, he plainly passes over the line of simplicity. But while we say this, we duly appreciate the weight and pertinency of what the preacher advances under each head, the ability of his discussions, the perspicuity and purity of his language, and the seriousness and fervency of spirit apparent in every part.

As a happy specimen of the preacher's views and manner of writing, we quote the following passage: p. 21.

'The transition from the rejection of the Gospel mysteries to a rejection of such other Gospel doctrines, as are exceptionable in the view of human reason under the influence of human pride or passion, was easy and natural. This experiment, too, has been made. With what success? Exactly such as might reasonably have been expected. The sceptic, finding such diverse and strange interpretations put upon a professed revelation, has been confirmed in his scepticism. The Infidel, finding all the essential peculiarities of the Gospel relinquished, has been confirmed in his Infidelity. The enemies of the cross of Christ, not its friends, have gained by this new mode of defending Christianity. The conciliatory champion

has advanced, until he has reached the enemy's camp, where he has been greeted as a friend. Hostilities from this moment have ceased. Is it asked, Wherefore? The plain answer is, Because "the offence of the cross has ceased." pp. 21, 22.

The other performances contained in this pamphlet are entitled to particular approbation.

XIX. *The Clergyman's Almanac; or, an Astronomical Diary and Serious Monitor, for the year of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, 1812.* Boston; Lincoln & Edmands.

It was with pleasure that, in the *Panoplist* for September last, we recommended the *Clergyman's Almanac* for 1811 to the notice of our readers; and it is with similar feelings, that we are able to mention the appearance of the fourth number of this useful publication. The author has pro-

ceeded on the same plan, and with the same spirit, as in his previous attempts. He has compressed many valuable thoughts, and serious reflections, into his pages. There is also a considerable variety of exhortation, anecdote, and poetry. We find one sentence, in the piece on *Spirituuous Liquors*, which should have been expunged. The style approaches, in some instances, to that species of blank verse, which is overloaded with common, though high-sounding, epithets. We mention these faults solely for the improvement of future numbers, which we hope will be annually published, while Almanacs are read or needed. Those who have seen the preceding numbers, will probably buy this; and those who only hear of the title, will, we should think, have some curiosity excited on the subject. We are desirous of doing all in our power to add to the well-deserved circulation, which this little work has already gained.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

Speech made by the Rev. Dr. Buchanan, at the late Anniversary Meeting of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews.

DURING my residence in the East, my mind was much occupied with the present state and circumstances of the Jews. I visited them in different provinces, examined their books, and discoursed with them on the subject of the prophecies; and I found that no where do they despair of being restored to Jerusalem; no where do they despair of beholding their Messiah. It is with great satisfaction, then, that on my return to England, I contemplate the establishment of your Society. It is, indeed, with much surprise I behold three hundred gentlemen assembled on the

present occasion, under the patronage of noblemen of our country, to promote this noble design. The sudden elevation of your Institution, and the interest which it has almost instantaneously created in the public mind, are sure prognostics of its perpetuity. It is one of those institutions which, like the Bible Society, need only to be proposed, to recommend itself to the minds of men, by its perfect reasonableness and propriety; and, I may add, by the Divine obligation it involves. I entertain a confident hope that this Society, or some institution analogous to it,

will be perpetual in the Church of Christ, and that it will endure, to use an oriental expression, as long as sun and moon endure; or at least, as long as there is a Jew in the world who is not a Christian.

There is a measure I would propose to the consideration of your society, which I think will contribute to its celebrity and success. I would suggest to you to open a correspondence with the Jews in the East.

Perhaps it may not be known to some, that by the events of the late war in India, a colony of Jews have become subject to Great Britain. This is the colony of the white and black Jews of Cochin. The number is calculated to be about 16,000. Mr. Frey informs me that the number of Jews in the United Kingdom is not reputed to be greater than 14,000. So that our Jewish subjects in the East are yet more numerous than those in the West; and they are equally entitled to the regard and attention of your Society.

I visited Cochin soon after the conquest of the province. The Jews received me hospitably, and permitted me to examine their Libraries and their Synagogues; and they presented to me many valuable manuscripts, which are now deposited in the library of the University of Cambridge. One of these is a Roll of the Pentateuch, on goat-skins, dyed red; one of the most ancient, perhaps, which the East can produce. The white Jews live on the sea coast, and have commerce with foreign nations: the black Jews live chiefly in the interior of the country. The Hindoos call them Israeli: they call themselves Beni-Israel, and not Jews: for their ancestors did not belong to Judah, but to the kingdom of Israel. They consider themselves to be descended from those Tribes who were carried away at the first captivity. In some parts of the East, the Beni-Israel never heard of the second Temple. They never heard of the Christian account of the coming of the Messiah. Some of them possess only the Pentateuch, and Psalms, and Book of Job. Others have no portion of Scripture left. But their countenance, and their observance of

the Sabbath, and of peculiar rites, demonstrate that they are Jews. The white Jews at Cochin despise the black Jews, as being of an inferior cast, and do not approve of intermarriages with them, because they do not belong to the Second Temple. Both among white and black Jews, I found that there was a general impression that there would soon be a rumor of wars, and a commotion among the people, on their account. The white Jews expect a second Cyrus from the West, who shall build their Temple the third and last time.

You may address the Jews of Cochin with great advantage on the subject of the Christian religion, for they have the evidence of the Syrian Christians before them. These ancient Christians live in the vicinity, and are your witnesses. At one place, in the interior the country, which I visited, there is a Jewish Synagogue and a Christian Church in the same Hindoo village. They stand opposite to each other; as it were the Law and the Gospel; bearing testimony to the truth, in the presence of the heathen world.

I was informed, that many years ago one of the Jews translated the New Testament into Hebrew, for the purpose of confuting it, and of repelling the arguments of his neighbors, the Syrian Christians. This manuscript fell into my hands, and is now in the library of the University of Cambridge. It is in his own handwriting, with the first interlineations and erasures; and will be of great use in preparing a version of the New Testament in the Hebrew language. It appears to be a faithful translation, as far as it has been examined; but about the end, when he came to the Epistles of St. Paul, he seems to have lost his temper, being moved perhaps by the acute argument of the learned Benjaminite, as he calls the Apostle, and he has written here and there a note of execration on his memory. But behold the providence of God! The translator himself became a convert to Christianity. His own works subdued his unbelief. In the lion he found sweetness; and he lived and died in the faith of Christ. And now it is a common superstition

among the vulgar in that place, that if any Jew shall write the whole of the New Testament with his own hand, he will become a Christian, by the influence of the evil spirit.

This event occurred in the South of India; but a conversion no less remarkable took place, some time afterwards, in the North. Jacob Levi, a Jew from Smyrna, travelled over land to Calcutta, and heard the Gospel from one of the Lutheran Preachers belonging to the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, and became a convert to the truth. He delivered a testimony to the Jews, Hindoos, Mahomedans, and Christians; for he was acquainted with various languages, and spoke eloquently, like Apollos. But his course was short. He was ordained like many witnesses of the Christian faith, to shine but for a moment. These solitary instances of the power of the Gospel seem to occur, in almost every nation, previous to the general illumination. This conversion of Jacob Levi is recorded in the Proceedings of the Society, in Bartlett's Buildings, London.

But there is another body of Jews, not a colony, but a kingdom of Jews, to which this society may also address itself; and that is, the ten Tribes. For the ten Tribes, so long lost, have at length been found. It has been sufficiently ascertained, by the investigations of the learned in India, that the Affghan and Pyran nations consist of the descendants of the Jewish Tribes of the first description.

When I was in the south of India, I asked the black Jews, where their brethren, the great body of the Ten Tribes, were to be found? They answered promptly, that they were to be found in the North, in the regions adjacent to Chaldea, the very country whither they were first carried into captivity. On my return to Calcutta, I prosecuted the inquiry, under the advantages which my superintendence of the College of Fort William afforded me. Sir William Jones had recorded it as his opinion, that the Affghans were Jews, and referred to various authorities. A further investigation confirmed the judgment of that illustrious scholar.

VOL. IV. *New Series.*

There were Affghan Jews in Calcutta, at the time: one of my own servants was an Affghan. The Affghans are generally reputed by us to be Mahomedans. I asked my servant if he was a Mahomedan? "No," said he, "I am a Mahomedan Jew." I plainly discerned in his countenance the features of the London Jew. The general account of the Affghans is this: that their ancestors were Jews; that their common histories record the names of David, Saul, and other kings of Israel; that the Mahomedans came upon them with an invading army, and said unto them, We are the Jews as well as you; we observe circumcision, and keep the Sabbath; let us incorporate our nations, and be one people, and unite against the Infidels; that they made a show of yielding to Mahomedanism, (as the Jews of Spain and Portugal pretended to yield to Christianity;) but in process of time the ascendancy of the new religion corrupted their ancient institutions; their sacred books began to diminish in number: and it came to pass at last, that in many places they could be only recognized to be Jews by their countenance, by tradition, by peculiar rites, and the observance of the Sabbath; which are the only marks which distinguish some of the Beni-Israel of the South of India. Let us, therefore, address the Ten Tribes, and receive them in the state in which, by the providence of God, they are to be found. Some of the Jews of London are as ignorant, and are as little entitled to the name, as the Affghans.

But there is a third body of Jews to whom you ought to write: I mean the SAMARITAN JEWS. They are not far from the shores of the Mediterranean, and are easily accessible. They possess only the Pentateuch. They are few in number, and will receive with much deference any communication which you will be pleased to make to them, relating to their religion and to the present state of Jewish nations.

Let letters then be addressed to these three bodies of Israelites; not in the name of CHRISTIANS, but in the name of the converted Jews, who compose a part of this Society. Let

Mr. Frey, the learned convert, write to them, not in the Rabbinical Hebrew, (for there are upwards of 20 dialects of Rabbinical or Commercial Hebrew in the world,) but in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, which all understand; let him inform them of the great events that have taken place in the West, namely, that the Jews have become Christians; that the Christians are sending forth preachers to teach all nations; that the Messiah is surely come; and that the signs of the Times encourage the belief that Israel is about to be restored, in a spiritual sense. Let him further direct their attention to particular prophecies, and invite correspondence. And after Mr. Frey has exercised his ministry a year or two longer in this country, it may be expedient that he go forth as a Missionary to the Jews of Cochin, with some of his brethren, that "in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established." After preaching among them half a year, he may return again, and report what he has heard and seen.

But when you write these letters, a PRESENT must accompany them, after the oriental manner. And let this present be the BIBLE. You need not, indeed, send the Old Testament to all: for the Jews of the east possess that Book entire, with every jot and tittle that belongs to it. They are our librarians; they are ordained by providence, as it were, the official guardians of the perpetual purity of the Sacred Volume. But you must send them the NEW TESTAMENT in the Hebrew tongue; in the language and character of the Old Testament, which all understand and revere. And let it have the MASSORA, that the Text may be settled by good authority, before it pass out of your hands. We Christians are, in regard to the New Testament, the Massorites; we are qualified to determine the sense. If the Version be sent forth without POINTS, the words of our Savior may be expounded by the Eastern Jews in different ways. The Arabic, Persian, Chaldaic, and Syriac languages, all have points. You may take them away, indeed, as has been done in the

Old Testament Hebrew; but if you do so, you will not be able to understand what is written, unless you have got it previously by heart. All the children learn these languages and the Hebrew, in the East, with points; and they are constantly used by grown persons, when the sense is doubtful. A letter, without points, on a new and difficult subject, would be an enigma. It is commonly said in Europe, "that the points are not of divine origin." But there is no meaning in this sentiment. If the consonants be of divine origin, the vowels are of divine origin. The consonants cannot be pronounced without the vowels. A consonant implies the presence of a vowel. The Hebrew consonants, which are said to be of divine origin, were changed in form by a heathen people. A child in the time of Moses would not have been able to learn the Book of Genesis without points. When he had got it by heart, indeed, the points would be of no use: and for this reason, and for no other, are they not used in the Synagogue. It is the labor of ten years for the Hebrew reader in the Synagogue to learn to read the Scriptures without points. Had not providence ordained the Massora of the Old Testament, it is impossible to say how great our difficulty might have been in translating that volume at this day: but the same providence which has preserved the consonants, has preserved the vowels also.

It is with surprise I learn, that as yet you have not obtained a Version of the New Testament in the Hebrew language for the use of the Jews. It is surely the very first duty of your Society to execute this translation. How can you find fault with a Jew, for not believing the New Testament, if he has never seen it? It is not to be expected that he will respect a version in English; but give him the New Testament in the language of the Old Testament, in the imposing form of the primeval Hebrew, the character which he is accustomed to venerate and admire, and then you do justice to his weakness, and may overcome his prejudice.

How strange it appears, that during a period of eighteen hundred years,

the Christians should never have given the Jews the New Testament in their own language! By a kind of infatuation, they have reprobated the unbelief of the Jews, and have never at the same time told them what they ought to believe.

I ought to apologize to the company for detaining them so long. [Applause.] I shall conclude with observing, that the chief difficulties which this Society will probably meet with, will be from the opposing Jews at home. But when they see that your converts multiply, and when they hear that you are writing to other nations, regardless of their ignorance and opposition at home; when they learn that you have DISCOVERED THE TEN TRIBES; that you have sent to them the New Testament in the holy language; that you are discussing with them the subject of the prophecies; and that Mr. Frey and his brethren are going forth as "ambassadors, in light ships, to carry the tidings of gladness to a nation scattered and peeled, terrible from their beginning hitherto," (Isaiah xviii,) the hostile Jews will be alarmed, their spirits will sink within them, and they will begin to think that a great day in Zion is indeed at hand.

Every time you meet here, in this public manner, in the presence of the Israelites, your cause acquires strength. Every time that these Annual Sermons are preached, and the voice of prayer and supplication for the outcasts of Israel ascends to heaven, it is like the blast of the rams' horns before the walls of Jericho: and so the enemy will soon begin to consider it; and I doubt not that before you have encompassed the walls seven times, an impression will be made. It may be the will of God, that before the trumpet of your Anniversary Assemblies has been seven times sounded, the wall will begin to shake; a breach will be made, and Joshua, the spiritual Joshua, will enter and take the city.

EXTRACTS FROM THE REV. THADDEUS OSGOOD'S JOURNAL.

Mr. Editor,

I have transcribed, and now send you, a very brief account of my last year's labors: And if you think it will be any gratification to your readers to see these extracts in print, you may give them a place in your useful publication.

AFTER handing in my last year's journal, which was closed the 30th of May, I spent five weeks in collecting books, and furnishing myself with the means of doing good, when I should arrive at the field of missionary labors.

I sat out from Boston the 23d of June, 1810. After spending a few days with my friends at Methuen, I proceeded on my journey, passing through Amherst, Keene, and Walpole to Dartmouth College; where I made a short stay, and then pursued my journey through Vermont into Lower Canada. I spent a few days at Montreal; and then went down to Quebec, where I tarried about a fortnight: which time was employed in procuring tracts to be printed, and collecting the offerings of the affluent to carry to the destitute. I left Quebec the 30th of August, and visited the St. Francis Indians, on the south side of the St. Lawrence. I was cordially received and kindly entertained by one of their chiefs, during my stay. I believe from what information I could obtain, that some faithful Protestant missionary would be very kindly received by that tribe. Some of these Indians feel unhappy in their situation. May the Lord send them relief, in that way which he sees to be best. I left the Indian village, and pursued my journey up the river, to St. John's; then crossed over to Montreal and spent about three weeks in getting tracts printed, and furnishing myself with books for the Upper Province. Passing up the Grand river, so called, about 30 miles, then turning southward, I came to the St. Lawrence at Cornwall, crossed over to the New York side, and went up to Ogdensburg, where I made some stay. I then crossed back to the

British shore, and proceeded up to Kingston: where I tarried a while to get a stock of tracts printed. I then pursued my journey around the bay of Quinte, to the head of lake Ontario. After spending some time between the lakes Erie and Ontario, I crossed over to the American shore, spending a number of days in the vicinity of Buffaloe. I then proceeded up the south shore of the lake, as far as Harpersfield, and turned southward to the Ohio, passing down this river to about an hundred miles below Pittsburgh. Having crossed the river, I went up through a corner of Virginia, and a part of Pennsylvania, to Pittsburgh, where I tarried about a fortnight to furnish books and tracts for those places, from which I had received applications for aid. I then crossed over the Laurel and Cumberland Mountains to the head waters of the Potowmac and passed down to the city of Washington. I tarried in the District of Columbia, about three weeks, superintending the tract business, preaching occasionally, and making collections towards defraying the expense of printing a large stock of tracts for distribution. I then pursued my journey to the southward, passing through Dumfries, Fredericksburgh, Richmond, Williamsburgh, Yorktown, and crossed over to Norfolk; where I tarried a few days, furnishing myself with more tracts for distribution. After collecting about a hundred dollars, and procuring some tracts to be printed, I returned to Richmond, by way of Petersburg. I made some collections, and procured 2000 tracts to be printed there. I then set out on my journey up James River as far as Charlottesville, where I spent the Sabbath and preached twice to a decent and respectful auditory. The following day I visited the seat of our late President, Mr. Jefferson, by whom I was kindly received, and furnished with some pecuniary aid towards carrying on my tract business. I returned to the District of Columbia, through Fredericksburg; and after settling with printers for work done during my absence, I set out for Boston, making some stay to collect books, and procure tracts to be print-

ed, in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and New York. I arrived at Boston the last of May, having been absent about eleven months; during which time I travelled upwards of three thousand miles preached 188 times, besides attending a number of religious conferences, and visiting many schools and private families. I administered the sacrament of the Lord's supper once, and assisted in this ordinance, on another occasion. I administered baptism to twelve subjects, five of whom were adults.

I have the past year, as well as the preceding years, solicited aid, by contribution, and private donations: and I have great reason to be thankful for the repeated proofs of liberality which have been manifested towards the plan, which I have been attempting to promote. Though this was the fourth time I have called upon individuals, both in Canada, and the United States, their hearts and purses were opened to afford me assistance. During the last year, I have been more successful than in any former year. The contributions, and private subscriptions, in books and money, within this period have amounted to about 2000 dollars. I say about 2000; for as most of the donations were received in books, and many of them second hand books, it is impossible to make an exact estimate of their value. But, according to the best computation I was able to make, their value will rather exceed that sum, than fall short of it. About \$730 of the abovementioned sum was received in cash: all of which, and some from my private property, has been expended in attempting to do good. I have paid \$170 for clothing, and necessary expenses; \$220 for books, and printing tracts, at Pittsburgh; and \$208, in Canada towards reprinting Porteus's Evidences of the Christian Religion, and other useful books and tracts. The remainder of the money received, was expended in purchasing books, and printing tracts. I paid money for printing, in Fredericktown, (Maryland,) Norfolk, Richmond, and Fredericksburgh, (Virginia,) and in Georgetown, and Washington City; also in Philadelphia and New York. I have also circulated

subscription papers towards establishing libraries in upwards of twenty towns and settlements on the frontiers; leaving in each place such rules and regulations, as if attended to, will be a barrier against vice, and a stimulus to improvement in knowledge and virtue. In each of the new settlements where I found any prospect of establishing a library, I subscribed five or ten dollars, promising to pay my subscription in good books, as soon as a moral association and library company were formed according to the constitution left them. If they did not choose to embrace the offer, according to the constitution, then of course I did not send the proposed aid. But I have heard from a number of towns where the terms have already been complied with. Several letters I have received on this subject since I left the State of Ohio; an extract from one of which I will here transcribe.

"Harpersfield, Feb. 13, 1811.

Rev. and much respected Sir,

We return you our grateful thanks for the proposals which you left us. We need not state to you what assistance you afforded us in forming a library company, when we inform you that our subscription amounts to 264 dollars. We have this day adopted a constitution, by which we have bound ourselves scrupulously to observe the laws you left us towards encouraging the youth to read and commit verses to memory. And we have formed a moral society and firmly bound ourselves to suppress vice. We do earnestly solicit your aid in procuring books for us, especially such as may be suitable for youth under eighteen years of age.

Wishing you success in the ministry, and in all your charitable designs, we request an interest in your prayers. May grace, mercy, and peace from God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit abide with you wherever you go. Amen.

Signed by order of the Trustees, of the Northern Social Library Company.

Jonathan Leslie, Librarian.

N. B. The above letter is from the clergyman of the town of Harpersfield, state of Ohio.

The books which I have collected I have either sent, or am making provision to send to the frontiers. Some of them are to be set up in small libraries for the benefit of the destitute, others are distributed gratis in schools and private families, with a view to promote a taste for reading. Several small libraries have already been brought into operation, and their good effects have been felt and acknowledged by many. And I have also had the best evidence, that the tracts and children's books have been useful: for I have heard hundreds of children recite pieces, which I had left them in a former visit. Could I be indulged with room, I might furnish some very striking instances in which I have seen the good effects resulting from my feeble exertions. But I must draw to a close, fearing that I have already trespassed upon the patience of the Editor, and his readers. In taking a general view of the business in which I have been engaged for four years past, I feel a peculiar satisfaction. Though I see much to lament and bewail both in myself, and others, yet from the numerous proofs of liberality, and the very kind and hospitable reception, witnessed in my last tour, I take encouragement to devote another year to the same business. And I pray God to give me strength, wisdom, prudence, and every necessary qualification, for the right discharge of so arduous an enterprise. I do fervently pray, that God would induce some one, more wise, more prudent, and in every respect better qualified to enter into the business in which I am engaged, either as a leader, or fellow-traveller. For I find, that I have taken more upon my hand than my small strength, and feeble abilities, will enable me to discharge to my own satisfaction.

Perhaps some of those gentlemen, who are thinking of devoting themselves to a foreign mission, would do well to look to our northern and western frontiers. They would see

in our own country, and in the Upper Province of Canada, a very great *field already white unto the harvest*. But it is extremely difficult to say, where laborers are most needed. May the friends of Zion universally and fervently pray, that the Lord of the harvest would send forth many faithful laborers to gather in his precious fruits. And it ought to be a subject of prayer, that the rich may bestow liberally of that which the Lord hath lent them, towards furnishing schoolmasters, religious teachers, and all the necessary aids of instruction, to those parts of the world which are now destitute. Many in our country, as well as in England and her Provinces, have contributed liberally towards civilizing and Christianizing the world: on whose heads blessings are descending. But many others, and some, who would be thought Christians, are like the rich fool mentioned in the Gospel, laying up stores of worldly goods for many years, and making a god of their earthly substance. May they see their folly before death shall close their eyes. And that God may enable all to conspire together, in the exercise of prayer, in the wise employment of time, and in the use of property, towards building up the glorious kingdom of our

Divine Redeemer, is the sincere desire of the public's most devoted, humble servant,

THADDEUS OSGOOD.
Boston, June 22nd, 1811.

We gladly subjoin to Mr. Osgood's communication the following opinion of his plans and labors, expressed by the Standing Committee of Missions of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in their last annual report. It will be recollected, that a considerable part of Mr. O's tour lies through the country over which the Presbyterian churches extend.

"Nothing now prevents the resuming of this mission, [to the Cherokee nation,] but the want of a person well qualified to conduct it. The committee entertained hopes of being able to obtain the services of the Rev. Mr. Thaddeus Osgood, an intelligent, active, enterprising, and zealous missionary; but, on conversing with him, it was found, that he is engaged in the prosecution of such plans for promoting morality, good order, and religion, along the frontiers of our country, that he cannot, consistently with duty, relinquish them. This disappointment is relieved by the belief, that Mr. O. will probably do much good by pursuing his own course."

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

NEW WORKS.

The prophecy of Daniel, relating to the time of the end, opened, applied and improved, in two discourses delivered on a public Fast, April 11, 1811. By Joseph Lathrop, D.D. Pastor of the First Church in West Springfield. Springfield, (Mass.) Thomas Dickman, 8vo. pp. 32 20cts.

A Sermon delivered before the Massachusetts Missionary Society, at their twelfth Annual Meeting, in Boston, May 28, 1811. By Timothy Dickinson, A.M. Pastor of the church in Holliston. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands.

God's government of the church and world, the source of great consolation and joy: Illustrated in a

Sermon preached at Hartford, May 9, 1811, before the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, at the Anniversary Election. By Stephen W. Stebbins, A.M. Pastor of the First Church in Stratford. Hartford; Hudson & Goodwin.

The foundation of God sure and sealed: a Sermon, preached July 31, 1811, at the installation of the Rev. Edward D. Griffin, D.D. to the pastoral care of the church in Park Street, Boston. By Samuel Worcester, A.M. Pastor of the Tabernacle Church in Salem. Boston; Saml. T. Armstrong.

An Oration, delivered in Brattleborough, July 4, 1811. By John Noyes, Esq. Brattleborough; William Fessenden.

A Statement of proceedings in the First Society in Coventry, Connecticut, which terminated in the removal of the pastor: with an Address to his late people. By Abiel Abbot, Pastor of the First Church in Coventry. Boston; John Eliot, jun. 1811.

An Address to the Massachusetts Charitable Fire Society; delivered before the members, at their seventeenth anniversary meeting, May 31, 1811. By Benjamin Pollard. Published at the request of the Society. Boston; Russell & Cutler.

The Speech of his Excellency Governor Langdon to the Legislature of New Hampshire, the Answer of the House of Representatives, and the Protest of the minority in the House. June session; 1811.

Letters addressed to the people of Pennsylvania, respecting the internal improvement of the Commonwealth, by means of Roads and Canals. By William J. Duane. Philadelphia; Jane Aitken. 1811.

An Address delivered before King Solomon's Lodge, Charlestown, on the anniversary of St. John the Baptist, June 24, A. L. 5811. By John Lathrop, A.M. Boston: Russell & Cutler.

An Oration delivered before the Washington Benevolent Society, at Washington Hall, in the City of New York on the 4th of July, 1811. By Robert Sedgwick, Esq. Published by the Society. New York; Largin & Thompson.

The Three Patriots; or, the Cause and Cure of present Evils: addressed to the voters of Maryland. Baltimore; B. Edes. 1811.

An Oration pronounced at Boston on the 4th of July, 1811, before the Supreme Executive, and in presence of the Bunker-Hill Association. By Henry A.S. Dearborn, M.B.A. Published by request. Boston; Munroe & French.

A Letter to a Great Character. Printed and published for the public. 1811.

A Word in Season, touching the present misunderstanding in the Episcopal Church. By a Layman. New York; D. & G. Bruce. 1811.

An inaugural Dissertation on Insanity; submitted to the public exam-

ination of the Trustees of the College of Physicians and Surgeons, in the State of New York, Samuel Bard, M.D. President, for the degree of Doctor of Medicine, on the 14th day of May, 1811. By Theodoric Romeyn Beck, A.M. Licentiate in Medicine of the Medical Society of the County of New York. N. Y.; J. Seymour. 1811.

Letter to the Vestry of Trinity Church, by Bishop Hobart, in answer to a pamphlet entitled "A solemn Appeal to the Church, by the Rev. Cave Jones." To which is added an appendix. By the Rev. T. Y. How. New-York; E. Sargeant.

A Sermon, delivered at the opening of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. May, 1811. By John B. Romeyn, D.D. Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Cedar-Street, New York. N. York: Whiting & Watson. 1811.

WORK IN PRESS.

Samuel T. Armstrong has in press *Christian Researches in Asia*, by the Rev. Claudius Buchanan, D. D. with two Discourses preached at Cambridge, in July 1810, and a Sermon preached before the Society for missions to Africa and the East, in June 1810, by the same author. The *Christian Researches* contain a body of most interesting and authentic information, with respect to the moral and religious state of the Hindoos, and the Jews and Christians in Asia. The profits of this edition are devoted to the support of Missions in India.

ORDINATION & INSTALLATION.

ORDAINED, on the 3d ult. the Rev. NOAH COE, by the Hudson Presbytery, to the work of the Gospel ministry, and *installed* pastor of the Church and Congregation in Chester, (N. Y.) Sermon by the Rev. Samuel Goodrich, of Berlin, (Conn.)

Installed, on the 31st ult. the Rev. EDWARD D. GRIFFIN, D. D. to the pastoral care of the church in Park Street, Boston. The introductory prayer was made by the Rev. Dr. Morse of Charlestown. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Worcester of Salem, from 2 Tim. ii, 19. The

Rev. Dr. Holmes of Cambridge made the installation prayer. The Rev. Mr. Greenough of Newton gave the charge; the Rev. Mr. Homer of Newton presented the right hand of fellowship; and the Rev. Mr. Huntington of Boston made the concluding prayer. The exercises were solemn and impressive, and gave great satisfaction to a very respectable audience.

MISSIONARY EXERTIONS.

Mr. Judson, one of the students at Andover who offered themselves to be employed in Foreign Missions, sailed from Boston for Liverpool in the month of January last. The objects of his voyage were, to make a full disclosure of his views, and those of his brethren, to the Directors of the London Missionary Society, and to obtain what information he could in relation to the demand for missions in Asia, and the probability of their success. Three weeks after he sailed, the ship was taken by a French privateer, and he, with the passengers and crew generally, was put on board the privateer and carried into a small port near St. Sebastians, and thence to Bayonne, where he was imprisoned with his fellow-passengers, and the crew. By the activity of an American residing there, he was immediately released from confinement, and remained a prisoner at large for six

weeks. Having obtained permission, he proceeded to Paris, and thence, after a fortnight's stay, to Morlaix. From this port he sailed in a cartel to Dartmouth, and reached London early in May. He was received with great kindness and affection by the friends of Missions in England, who are much animated with the prospect of being joined in their Missionary labors by Christians in the United States. Mr. Judson visited the Missionary Seminary at Gosport, and attended the annual meeting of the London Missionary Society. The Directors consented to take into their service the young gentlemen who offered themselves, relying, however, upon aid from the American churches. As the London Missionary Society expend more than 7,000 pounds annually (above 31,000 dollars) in the Missionary cause, and as the only resources for this great demand are in occasional bequests, and annual contributions, they look with confidence for pecuniary exertions on the part of Christians in this country. They will not look in vain. The Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions meet in the course of next month, and will doubtless devise such measures, as shall make the public more fully acquainted with the claims of the heathen on the beneficence of Christians.

OBITUARY.

DIED, lately, at Vincennes, (Ind. Ter.) Lieut. JENNINGS of U. S. army, shot by Capt. Pozey. The newspaper account of this murder is as follows: 'It is stated, that some misunderstanding took place between the parties, and P. sent a challenge which J. would not accept; that, shortly after, P. asked J. into a room, offered two pistols for his choice, and told him to fight, or be shot; that on his still refusing, P. fired at and wounded him; that J. then wrested the discharged pistol from P. and attempted to leave the room, when Pozey fired the other pistol, shot Jennings dead, and then escaped.'

This atrocious murder was perpetrated in the true spirit of duelling. Though duellists profess to be exempt from base and revengeful passions, it will be found that the challengers, in a great majority of instances, are desperately bent on revenge of the most bloody and malicious kind. Of this they generally give infallible proofs. How besotted, then, must be the understandings, and how hardened the hearts of those, who continue to encourage this exhibition of wickedness, by palliating its enormity, or shielding it from punishment.

ERRATUM.

The title of *D. D.* was placed by mistake after the name of the Rev. *Richard S. Storrs* instead of being placed after the name of the Rev. *Elijah Parish*, in p. 86 of our last number.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

We are obliged to omit for want of room, a Review of Miss More's new work, *Practical Piety*.